BERKELEY BAPTIST DIVINITY SCHOOL LIBRARY

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

April, 1941

THUS SPEAK THE DEANS AND PRESIDENTS — *A Symposium* — 89

THE ESSENCE OF CHRISTIANITY — *Edgar Sheffield Brightman* — 111

THE METRICAL STRUCTURE OF II KINGS 19: 20-28 — *Theophile J. Meek* — 126

THE POPULAR RELIGION OF GREECE AND ITS SURVIVALS — *Walter Woodburn Hyde* — 132

IS ROMAN CATHOLICISM WINNING? — *Conrad Henry Moehlman* — 157

LIGHT FROM THE GREEK TEXT ON THE DATE OF GALATIANS — *H. E. Dana* — 160

FROM OFF THE CAMPUS AND ON — 164

BOOK REVIEWS — 166

BOOK NOTICES — 181

BOOKS RECEIVED — 187

Volume XVIII — Number 2

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

Published by
Crozer Theological Seminary
Chester, Pennsylvania

MORTON S. ENSLIN, Editor
RITTENHOUSE NEISSER, Business Manager

The policy of the CROZER QUARTERLY is to present investigations, discussions, and reviews in the field of religion which will prove of value and interest to the professional student of religion and to the layman.

Manuscripts, books for review, and communications for the editor should be addressed
Editor of the CROZER QUARTERLY
Chester, Pennsylvania
Business communications and subscriptions should be addressed
Business Manager of the CROZER QUARTERLY
Chester, Pennsylvania

Issued Quarterly $1.50 a year Single Numbers, 40 cents

Printed for the Crozer Theological Seminary by
THE JUDSON PRESS
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Entered as second-class matter, December 21, 1923, at the post office at Chester, Pa., under Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized December 21, 1923.

Copyright, April, 1941, by Crozer Theological Seminary.

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

Vol. XVIII APRIL, 1941 No. 2

THUS SPEAK THE DEANS AND PRESIDENTS

A SYMPOSIUM

[These papers by the presidents and deans of sixteen representative theological seminaries and divinity schools in the United States and Canada were written in answer to the invitation to express their "views as to the real purpose and aim of a theological seminary." Each writer was left with entire freedom as to the form of presentation. No author has had any intimation as to what his fellow executives have written. To the one necessary restriction—extreme brevity—each writer has graciously bowed. To avoid any seeming attempt to trace any common pattern or to throw into contrast possible divergencies, the several papers are arranged in the alphabetical order of the institutions concerned.—THE EDITOR]

ANDOVER NEWTON THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

No SEMINARY was ever founded with more painstaking care and with more meticulous attention to every duty, detail, and contingency than Andover in 1807. The purpose was very clearly stated in the opening words of the original constitution signed by Samuel Adams and the Phillipses which linked the foundation with Phillips Academy. This additional benefaction was made "for increasing the number of learned and able defenders of the Gospel of Christ as well as of orthodox, pious, and zealous ministers of the New Testament." These words were destined to reappear many times in the stormy history of Andover and finally to rescue the ancient school from the shackles and imprisonment of the largely forgotten but justly celebrated Andover Creed. For it was successfully maintained before the Supreme Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts that an appeasement creed drawn up to satisfy two parties of belligerent Calvinists when strictly enforced as it should be in the terms of the trust would defeat by its inevitable constrictions the original purpose of the Seminary.

Here is the obvious lesson for all seminaries. Methods can defeat purposes. The aims of a seminary were rightly conceived in that somewhat distant and far different day. They are the same now, certainly for most of us. The phrasing might be changed but the intent is unchanged—*to increase the number of those who under all conditions can defend and propagate the Christian faith and nourish the Christian flock.*

This twofold aim remains sacred. Methods are not sacred. We are in danger, however, of defending our methods and departments as if they were sacrosanct and of themselves constituted both the faith and the sheepfold. It is of great consequence that we send out men who defend and impart faith and who fortify faith in the sorely besieged souls of this day. It is of great consequence that we send out ministers of the New Testament who, like Paul, can say, "ourselves, your servants for Christ's sake." It is of less consequence how these ends are accomplished. If we have become the slaves of our methods, let us seek a new freedom in Jesus Christ.

E. C. HERRICK

Newton Centre, Massachusetts

BERKELEY DIVINITY SCHOOL

THE COÖPERATIVE PLAN. It is probably true of our students as of those of other theological schools that, although some pay their own way, there are many who need financial aid. School charges are $420 per year—which includes tuition, room, and board. An additional $130 is needed for personal expenses. At the beginning of the year a careful scrutiny is made of each student's resources, and we help him plan how to get this $550. Some bring money with them, nearly all are helped by family or friends, their bishop or parish, or by one of the Church societies which aid theological students. We discourage their earning money by lay-reading or other practical activities. This does students little good, and interferes with study. The best time for practical training is in the long summer vacation. How then secure the necessary financial aid? We have a few scholarships. But our chief reliance is upon our "Coöperative Plan." Under this plan every student, whether he needs financial aid or not, works six hours each week under the governing student council. He may do outdoor work on the School grounds, mowing lawns, raking leaves, shovelling snow, sawing wood, emptying ash cans, or he may work in the library or office, and all wait on tables in the School refectory. The proceeds of such work, and of all done outside the School, go into a common fund which is divided periodically among those who need help. We believe our coöperative plans solve the thorny problem of how to aid the needy student without demoralizing him. And it has other great advantages. It is democratic—there is no distinction between the needy and affluent, or between big jobs and little ones. It accustoms the student to work, and the sort of work he may have to do later if he lands in a small parish with a family to support. It trains him in habits of thrift and careful budgeting, for one requirement is

that all current debts shall be promptly paid. Above all, it encourages the spirit of community living and coöperative achievement.

Curriculum. Though practically all our students hold college degrees, we find that degrees are no guarantee of an elementary education. Most college graduates seem never to have learned to think for themselves, and they cannot even read, write, speak, or spell correctly. We have to give them something of what they missed in the grammar school. Our Church canons largely determine the subjects of the theological curriculum. Diocesan examiners may give easy tests, and bishops can dispense from Greek. But to cover the canonical subjects takes three years, especially when bishops require Greek of students who can never get farther than learning to translate the parts of the Greek Testament with which they are familiar in the English version.

Berkeley has the great advantage of being affiliated with Yale University. Thus all our students take elective courses at the Yale Divinity School, for which they find time in spite of the canons. This gives them contact with students preparing for the ministry of various churches, and in other ways broadens their outlook. We lay what some might call an undue emphasis on theology, on church history, and on Prayer Book. All entering students take a 50-hour course in the ante-Nicene period during their first term. They read nothing but the sources—from the Acts of the Apostles to the Nicene Canons—a rather terrifying experience for college graduates accustomed to spoon-feeding. Three courses in the Prayer Book are required. Here, too, the work is largely among sources, especially what bears on the liturgical tradition of the Western Church, from Justin Martyr on. We pay much attention to training in church music and to the proper conduct of worship. We teach the Bible, of course, from the critical point of view, but we lay special emphasis on contents, and we try not to forget that we are preparing men to be Christian pastors and not Old Testament or New Testament professors. Outside the theological curriculum we encourage students to take advantage of concerts, lectures, and other cultural opportunities such as a university centre like New Haven offers in abundance. For all this three years is too short a time. But for that period we find students take a growing satisfaction in their work, and if they were required to stay for a fourth year they might grow stale and unhappy. We often advise good students to take postgraduate work at some other school.

Discipline. Our academic standards seem to be about the same as those of the Yale Divinity School or Union Theological Seminary. But theological education cannot be thought of in merely academic terms. An academicism which assumes: so many courses = so many credits =

a theological degree = fitness for ordination makes the word of God of none effect. A theological seminary should be primarily a Christian community, and the decisive question is whether the student has the ability and disposition which qualifies him for Christian leadership. Deans and professors should be pastors no less than scholars; they should maintain high standards of devotion and discipline, and should drop all students who do not appear to have a "vocation." "Ascetic theology" is one of our courses required of all new men. Such subjects are discussed as corporate and private prayer, meditation, devotional reading, living by rule, theology and conduct, the ideal minister, the ideal theological student. It is an orientation course, partly intellectual orientation, but chiefly orientation to the seminary life on which the student is entering. Our chapel services are the Prayer Book, Morning and Evening Prayer, the former at 8, the latter in the late afternoon, the Holy Communion coming twice each week. Students conduct a part of every service, and often an entire service. Chapel attendance is not required, but though we seldom urge it or speak of its importance, the students all attend regularly. This is perhaps in part a result of the course in ascetic theology.

The above observations about the Berkeley Divinity School are offered because they completely escape any quantitative analysis such as the one made in 1930 by the Association of Theological Schools and published in four volumes under the title *The Education of American Ministers.*

W. P. LADD

New Haven, Connecticut

CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

I WELCOME the opportunity and, indeed, the challenge of trying to put into five hundred words "the real aim and purpose of a theological seminary" in terms of the school I know best.

Obviously the basic purpose is to provide the church with a continuing educated ministry, trained, intelligent, and capable of leadership adequate to the age. How this goal is to be achieved, is not so easy to determine. Shall it be through a rigid scheme of linguistic, biblical, theological, and historical studies according to the traditional pattern? Or shall studies closer to the living needs of this tumultuous age be introduced? Shall it be primarily an academic discipline or shall large elements of actual laboratory practice be provided through supervised field work?

Our procedure here at this Seminary tends toward the second alter-

native in both cases. For example, we have practically eliminated the linguistic requirements. All our students are college graduates and must have had the discipline of studying some foreign language in college. They may study Greek and Hebrew here, but it is not required. In this way we make room for studies in the social and psychological fields which we conceive to be far more useful equipment for the modern minister than the acquiring of a knowledge of two more foreign languages. We also emphasize courses in religious education, church administration, religious drama and literature, speech, music, missions, and even provide optional training in arts and crafts.

Theology, church history, and the Bible are still at the focus of attention, but the time formerly absorbed by linguistic studies is now devoted to the sociology of religion, in order that the young minister may understand the social facts and forces which surge around his church, and to courses in mental hygiene and pastoral counseling that he may also understand the tensions and conflicts within the minds of those to whom he ministers.

Graham Taylor once said to one of our students: "Keep your head in the stars but your feet in the mud!" We are mindful of that in the process of theological education, and so every student is assigned to a definite task of field work under supervision both from the church or social agency he serves and from the Seminary. This prevents the student from being just an academic person. It brings him face to face with reality and the lives of common folks every week.

But the Seminary has other functions than training future ministers. It must also be a research agency for the church, exploring problems on the growing edge of religion in scholarly and scientific fashion. Some of the time and energy of its faculty, therefore, must be safeguarded for productive scholarship, the writing of books, and advanced study and exploration in their respective fields.

And, finally, just as a wise manufacturer will always "service his product," so the Seminary has a ministry of reinforcement, refreshment, and renewed courage to render to the men out in the active pastorate. We seek to accomplish this by our "Ministers' Week" each February and our "Pastors' Institute" each August, by library extension service, the widespread speaking activities of our faculty members, and by the publication of a vital little magazine called the Seminary *Register* which is sent free of charge to all our alumni and also to all Congregational Christian pastors in the Middle West.

ALBERT W. PALMER

Chicago, Illinois

THE COLGATE-ROCHESTER DIVINITY SCHOOL

We give the best professional training we can to a carefully selected group of men who desire to enter the Christian ministry, taking them after college graduation and carrying them to the professional degree of B.D. Our major purpose is to prepare ministers and leaders of churches.

We are the servant of all the churches and accept qualified students from various denominations, but we feel a special responsibility to equip well-trained leaders for the Baptist denomination, with which we have been and are closely associated.

We accept only such men as give evidence of Christian character and conviction, sincerity of purpose, and promise of useful work in the ministry. We feel it to be our responsibility to help them develop their highest potentialities, by pursuing with them the methods of honest scholarship, by helping them to understand and deepen their own religious experience and motivation, to increase their own powers of thought, their knowledge of God and of their fellow men, and to formulate a message which will be true to the eternal dynamic values of the Christian faith and be relevant to life today. In a word, we want to help them to be "good ministers of Jesus Christ," effective leaders of churches and builders of the Kingdom of God in the changing world of today and tomorrow.

Our curriculum is unique because it has rearranged the numerous theological courses in four areas: *Christian Origins* (Old Testament and New Testament); *Christian Progress* (history of Christianity); *Christian Interpretation* (theology, ethics, history of religions); *Christian Leadership* (practical courses).

The courses of study in the Old Testament are designed to make the student familiar with the Hebrew Scriptures and with the origin and development of the institutions and religious ideas of the Hebrew people. These are studied not only for their own value but also because Christianity has roots in Hebrew soil. The courses in the New Testament are planned to give the student as thorough knowledge as possible concerning the situation in which Christianity arose and the forces which operated in its origin and early development. The religious leader must have some knowledge of Christian history if he is to read religious literature intelligently and deal sympathetically with the denominationalism of our country. The historical courses are planned to convey the essential facts. A religious leader needs even more a scientific understanding of the workings of religious history, of the forces which build

religious institutions, crystallize beliefs, and precipitate religious movements. The personal experience of the individual is too brief to give this. Historical insight will give the backward and forward look that makes a man more than a day laborer in the Kingdom of God.

The courses of study in the field of *Christian Interpretation* are intended to introduce the student to a further insight into the basic character of the religious life in mankind universally and to an apprehension of its significance in relation to the world of human experience, with the aim of unfolding the supreme character of the Christian faith and its mission to all mankind. In Christian theology the attempt is made, from the standpoint of the Christian experience in its widest range, to present an orderly exposition of the genius of the Christian faith, its fundamental principles and beliefs as respects its relation to human life, to the world, and to the Supreme Being, and a vindication of its claim to a universal human allegiance. In Christian ethics are studied the nature of the moral ideal, its relation to the Christian view of God and man and the world, and the use of Christian character and conduct as a test of truth and theology.

In *Christian Leadership* preaching, worship, and church organization receive primary emphasis. An important phase of the activity of this group is the supervision of the field work of the students. The principle of this supervision is the conviction that such work should be viewed as primarily educational rather than economic.

On the campus it is our attempt to create a mood of sincere religious quest, a fellowship between faculty and students not only in classrooms but in personal conference, group worship, and in mutual interest in the common community and world tasks of the Kingdom, so that each student will pursue his studies and make his religious adjustments in the congenial atmosphere of Christian counsel and friendship.

The Institution is recognized to be a part of the whole Christian movement operating within the social framework of our time, its faculty and students mutually followers of Jesus Christ and servants of the common good.

A. W. BEAVEN

Rochester, New York

CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

AT THIS crucial hour when almost everything in the life of man is under severe scrutiny, theological seminaries should stand resolutely and at all costs for reality in the realm of religion. Compromise with fallacies, however widely they may be accepted, should be scorned.

At such an hour as this it is the primary task of seminaries to send out fearless religious leaders who will think clearly, speak courageously, and exemplify Christ in their lives. And if a seminary is to send out such prophets, its own faculty must be as free as the heads of departments in the great universities to explore reverently in any direction, and to announce their deepest convictions. Likewise, the students must enjoy a similar freedom in the laboratory of religious thought to reach their own conclusions.

A seminary should teach that The Eternal is "from everlasting to everlasting," and is "the same yesterday, today, and forever." It should repudiate the heresy that The Eternal was revealed more truly to a chosen few in the distant past than to men today. There is more light yet to break, and prospective religious leaders should be taught that "greater things than these" are to be done by those who yield themselves as fully to the Eternal Christ as did the Man of Galilee.

Religion is rooted in life, past and present, and it must ever be life-centred unless faith is to degenerate into sacerdotalism or a string of irrelevant doctrines. So a prophet must be interested in whatever affects the welfare of man, whether it is the inner life, the cry for physical betterment, racial barriers, devastating warfare, or general social problems. Therefore, while a seminary should place large emphasis on various branches of scholarship, including history, philosophy, and all that may be known regarding origin and content of the books of the Bible, students should be made conscious of the great areas of human need today and they should be helped to develop a passion and warmth both in preaching the gospel and in applying its principles to all human relationships. Especially should the meaning of the Cross in life-service be emphasized. But a seminary cannot teach everything. Usually it must be content to offer those courses which are basic and which stimulate students to go on and on in their search for truth in every realm and in preparation for service. Yet students should know that there are isms in the world today "which must be interpreted in the terms of religion," and that these isms are "hot religions" which cannot be dispelled "by lukewarm religions," however superior the latter may be considered by their adherents. "You will have to match them with a religion which is more true and more adequate."[1]

Of course, a seminary should acquaint its students with the great missionary enterprise and the modern ecumenical movements which promise much in the development of a world-wide Christian fellowship. But at the same time it should be pointed out that in many of our

[1] W. L. Sperry, *The Meaning of Religion*, p. 22.

churches today there may be discovered in embryonic form some of the conditions which seem to have been primarily responsible for the destructive attack on the Holy Orthodox Church in Russia. Reality in religion should be a primary objective of a seminary.

JAMES H. FRANKLIN

Chester, Pennsylvania

DUKE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF RELIGION

THIS PAPER, as I understand the editor's request, is to present "the real purposes and aim of a theological school," as we see them and are attempting to work them out in the Duke University School of Religion.

The primary aim of a theological school, such as ours, is to train men for the Protestant ministry, both as preachers and pastors. We have in addition two closely related aims: first, to train religious workers for such positions as directors of religious education, pastors' assistants, home and foreign missionaries, and social workers; and secondly, to develop enough scholars in the field of religion, broadly defined, to supply the needs of the church as teachers and executives in schools related to the church and as editors and contributors to religious periodicals.

While we do not regard scholarship alone as a sufficient preparation for the ministry, we believe that one who is to interpret the gospel effectively to this generation and to deal with religious problems with intelligence needs a broad general culture, thorough scholarship, and specialized training. Consequently our School is a strictly graduate school with a three-year course leading to the B.D. degree. We provide courses for advanced studies in the field of religion for those not expecting to enter the ministry, leading to the master's and doctor's degrees, but students taking this work register in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences which confers these degrees.

On the professional side we try to adjust our courses constantly to the changing needs both of the church at large and of our special field. Such changes in recent years have been in two main directions: 1. a larger emphasis on homiletics, 2. larger provision of courses in the social sciences, especially sociology, psychology, and modern philosophy, and 3. special training for the service of rural communities. We feel that the importance of the pulpit has been increased, rather than diminished, by the radio and press and that a genuine revival of religious life and interest must be largely mediated by a stepping up of the pulpit power of the clergy in general and by a succession of great preachers. The great failure of modern civilization has come through a vast increase of me-

chanical power and material resources without a corresponding development of spiritual power and controls; hence the need of the social sciences and a great access of spiritual fervor and dedication. That a Christian minister must have a personalistic philosophy goes without saying.

Our School is committed, both by the desire of its founder and by the needs of the South, to special emphasis on the training of ministers for the rural churches. Special courses on the problems of the country church are given. In addition to those students who have year round appointments as pastors, about two-thirds of our students spend ten weeks of their summer vacations as assistants to rural pastors or in other rural church work. This practical work is done under personal supervision and is the basis, in clinical fashion, of special training.

Our ideal is a highly trained ministry which is wholly committed to the search for truth in all realms, which has no quarrel with the natural sciences in their own sphere, and which is passionately dedicated to the Christian ideals, worked out intelligently according to the laws and nature of human personality.

ELBERT RUSSELL

Durham, North Carolina

EMMANUEL COLLEGE

It is a great asset to a young minister if he has behind him a family heritage of integrity and piety; like capital, such a heritage will yield him new income every year of his life. And he must have character and staying power of his own. This character is shaped in experience, partly before college days, partly in the seminary, partly later. But whether in the seminary or out of it, the character he needs is not formed by discussion or exhortation, but by bearing responsibility. Then he must have a liberal education in arts and theology if he is 1. to know the world in which he lives, 2. to enter into the common heritage of mankind, and 3. to know specifically what Christianity is. Last of all, every candidate needs some practice in doing the things that a minister has to do, but it is after his ordination that he will learn most about how to do them.

Arts. A man's chief concern in college is to make some appreciative —and critical—acquaintance with the common heritage and with the contemporary scene. This involves ordinarily the study of language and literature, history, philosophy, politics and economics, and natural science. He is a lucky man if in his arts course he escapes two pitfalls: 1. These subjects may come to him as so many snippets of knowledge, and he may never get a glimpse of the organism of truth, the great design that holds them all together in the real world. 2. His understanding of what

Christianity is may be left outside to shiver in the cold, instead of growing *pari passu* with his advance in the understanding of other subjects.

Theology. Theology is one. The Bible, church history, systematic theology, etc. belong together; they are not so many disconnected subjects like Greek, geology, economics, etc. Every minister needs to be well-grounded in all the theological subjects; much of the free election of courses in the last generation was folly. The same is true of a professor of theology; every professor should be master of the whole curriculum. I ought not to be put in the Old Testament chair unless I know the New Testament almost as well as the Old, and systematic theology almost as well as both; and I ought to be dismissed if I do not keep growing more competent in all the theological disciplines. Every professor will then teach his particular subject against the background of the whole body of theological learning.

And he will teach it face to face with the whole range of work that a minister has to do. Of course there will be instruction and drill in public speaking, preaching, praying, etc., but teachers of the Bible, of history of doctrine, dare never take their eyes off the concrete world where their students are to have the cure of souls.

The discipline of the young men's conduct and their training in the best habits of devotion are not matters of secondary interest. Great care also needs to be taken—and continuous care—that the young men shall during their seminary course enter still more fully into the common human heritage of literature, philosophy, and political thought, and at the same time come by a deeper and better balanced understanding of the contemporary scene.

There can be no uniform curriculum for all seminaries. Given a body of young men of character and steady purpose, and given a company of professors of diversified competence, a local curriculum can be drawn up that will be the best in that situation, such a curriculum as affords each professor the opportunity to give all that is in him to the young men, such a curriculum as moulds the young men into purveyors to the world of the whole Church's treasures in thought, devotion, and Christian discipline.

RICHARD DAVIDSON

Toronto, Ontario

EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

THE IDEAL I hold for my own Seminary is that it should be a school:

1. Where carefully chosen men who have answered the call of Christ will be helped to grow in love for God and for men by sharing in a

disciplined habit of common prayer, in a simple, brotherly life with one another and their teachers, and in honest, fearless study of God's truth.

2. Where a group of Christian scholars will guide those who are to be leaders of the Church in the reverent and open-minded study of the Bible and of the Church's history and teaching, always remembering that their calling is to be interpreters of life to their fellows; where the faculty never forget that the test of their success is the capacity of those whom they teach to think soundly and independently for themselves; and where the task of preparing men for a practical ministry in Christ's name is kept in the centre without neglecting the Church's need for learning and for well-trained teachers and writers.

3. Where those who are to be preachers will be trained to think deeply of God and man and sin and salvation, and to speak simply and clearly to common men; where those who are to be priests will first learn to pray themselves and then make ready to guide others into an understanding use of the means of spiritual growth that the Church brings to them in prayer and sacrament; where those who are to be pastors will be offered directed experience in ministering to the sick, the fearful, and the perplexed, and helped to a deeper insight into the needs of actual men and women and children.

4. Where men will be made more sensitive to the hurts of the poor, the despised, and the underprivileged; where the injustices of our world are clearly seen and felt; where, at the same time, those who are to minister to all sorts and conditions of men are kept realistically aware of the moral perplexities and burdens of the rich, of the strong, and of those who carry heavy responsibilities.

5. Where teachers and students join a reverent loyalty to our great inheritance in Christ's Church with a fearless welcome to the truth God is presenting to us in the living present; where the special gifts of our own Episcopal Church are treasured, but men's eyes are opened to the gifts of other communions, Catholic and Evangelical, and where they are prepared for service in a greater Church.

ANGUS DUN

Cambridge, Massachusetts

THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE TASK committed to the theological seminary is obviously in the main that of preparing men for the pastoral ministry. Provision must therefore be made for courses in the Bible, in church history, in Christian doctrine, in moral theology, in social ethics, etc., and for training a man in certain techniques of worship, preaching, teaching, and ministration. All these

cover much more ground and involve a much more intense discipline than is ordinarily supposed. But far more than this is involved. Matters of content and method of instruction are important and may well be the subject of frequent discussion and revision, but it is never to be forgotten that the main purpose of the whole process is that of charging a young man's relationship to life with an unfailing sense of the presence and power and love of the living God as he has revealed himself in nature, in history, in the Bible, and above all in the life and death and rising again of our Lord Jesus Christ and in the fellowship of his Church. The effort must be made to bring the student to the point where almost instinctively he sees every problem of thought or action in the light of the Christian doctrine of God in all its fullness and majesty. He must be made to feel completely at home in the corporate life of the Church, accepting joyously its discipline and worship, but it is the Church not as an end in itself but as God's instrument for the redemption of his world in which he must rejoice to find himself so that he may not be the prey of ecclesiastical introversion. He will be prepared for a ministry to individuals which with all due regard for the need of each soul will be content with nothing less than enabling that soul to find its place in God's redeeming purpose, its look turned upward and outward, away from self. Sensitive to human need of every sort, seeing life as it is with all its mingled good and evil, its desperate striving and sad confusion, his concern with problems of social welfare will be constant and profound but dominated throughout by the pervasive reference to the wholeness of God's purpose for his world. In a word, he is to be sent forth to be in the community in which he ministers humbly but preëminently a man of God.

This is the tremendous task entrusted to the theological seminary. It demands breadth and depth of learning, for he whom we worship is Lord of all life and truth and no aspect of his world is outside the range of his love, and, above all, it asks for a care for the individual student which recognizes that no expenditure of time and effort is too great if he may be made a true servant of God.

HUGHELL FOSBROKE

New York, New York

THE HARTFORD SEMINARY FOUNDATION

Despite the confusion of these tumultuous times, the conviction persists that men want light rather than darkness, that they would rather love than hate, that they prefer not to kill their fellows but to serve them. God's purposes are seeking human expression and embodiment in sounder

recognitions of relative worth, loftier points of reference, juster and more generous attitudes and relationships, all of these resting upon a deeper devotion of individual men and women to the following of Christ's way of revelation and empowering.

The Christian Church has consistently held to such objectives. Being a human institution, it has fallen short and merited criticism. But even so, there is no other comparable focus of radiation for proclaiming with vigor the eternal message of God's will; no other comparable group out of whose rededication can come such leavening influences in the life of neighborhoods and nations; no other comparable institution which may become in more dynamic terms a powerhouse of spiritual understandings and determinations.

But the Church cannot drift along of itself. The gospel must be plainly preached to the indifferent as well as the avid. Young and old must be taught the meaning and applications of "The Golden Rule" and "The Kingdom of Heaven." Men and women want wise counsel and guidance in their personal problems. Far lands are asking for helpers as they try to think and live their way to better things. Here our leadership demands taxing to the utmost limit the very finest personalities, plus the best specialized training.

In such a thrilling sequence of facts do we find spiritual charter for such a school as the Hartford Theological Seminary. And to fulfill his twofold task of inspiration and direction, the minister as leader of a church must have:

1. Knowledge of what the Christian religion is as a vitalizing faith;
2. Knowledge of what the environment is in which Christianity is to be planted;
3. Knowledge of how to plant and nurture Christianity within the environment.

Specifically to supply this knowledge, and to make it dynamic in the personalities of those who are taught, is the task of a theological training school. It must encourage fearless, open-eyed, intense and persistent scholarship; stimulate the search for truth as revealed in the Bible, as made manifest in the unfolding of God's purposes in history, as attained by the earnest strivings of rational thought, as tested by its efficiency in the lives of men.

In all these ways, the Hartford Theological Seminary, in company and coöperation with other similar centres, is seeking to make its contribution toward the building of a better world, a Christian world, through the power of God unto salvation.

R. W. BARSTOW

Hartford, Connecticut

HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL

WHEN SOCRATES was asked whether virtue could be taught, he replied, in effect, that virtue is not teachable but that a subject like geometry is. He then explained that after a student has mastered the non-debatable details of geometry he should be ready to discuss intelligently the things which are debatable, virtue among them. The distinction between teachable facts and debatable values may be applied, I think, to theological education. In our theological *curriculum* we ought to seek out the facts with the aid of the most rigorous intellectual methods. In our theological *community life* we should find a place for the development of those practical and spiritual attitudes by which we live.

This seems to me to need special emphasis today when we realize more keenly than ever that spiritually speaking we are come-outers, Protestants, rebels against the present order. The conflict between what we have and what we desire is so sharp that we are impelled to carry its influence over into our intellectual life and to cultivate in our theology a sense for the discontinuity between the so-called truths of man and the revelation of God. Our moral discouragement tempts us to distrust our scholarly standards and their final efficacy where the truth about God is concerned. Church history is no longer history but a special record of a special institution. Theology is no longer philosophy but an account of God's doings which we must "humbly," that is, uncritically, accept. In a word, man is not a thinker but a sinner in whom is no intellectual health.

This tendency we must resist with all possible energy. Obviously our personal judgments, our faith, our religious beliefs take us outside the limited range of our intellectual interests, but this does not mean that theology as an academic discipline has no place for objective study. It is hard to see what R. G. Collingwood has in mind when he writes: "If we required theological students to take a course in philosophy, we should prescribe a theistic philosophy and pass hastily over the others." To me it seems that our theism arises out of the attitude we take toward philosophy as a whole. It is true that we cannot hope to know for ourselves or to introduce our students to more than an outline of the field, but it should be an outline and not a corner. Theology is still queen of the sciences not because it makes use of special pleading, but because it strives for a synthesis which shall be effective in practical life.

I have written this as a personal opinion but I believe it is not wholly out of line with the policy of Harvard Divinity School which centres its instruction in the discipline of church history treated as an aspect of

history in general. Goethe did not express the whole truth but he did say some very pertinent things in the lines

Wer Wissenschaft und Kunst besitzt
Hat auch Religion.
Wer jene beiden nicht besitzt
Der habe Religion.

J. S. BIXLER

Cambridge, Massachusetts

PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

CHRISTIAN CHURCHES have founded and maintained theological schools for three major purposes: to prepare men for the ministry, to train teachers of religion for colleges and seminaries, and to equip scholars to advance the frontiers of religious knowledge.

What the preparation of men for leadership of the churches of tomorrow means can be stated in simple terms. Professional training should enable the prospective minister: 1. to mediate to people the inherited resources of the Christian religion: its Bible, its history, its convictions, its culture, its spiritual disciplines; 2. to formulate a faith for today, a core of living convictions; 3. to interpret people to themselves in the wide range of failure, loneliness, ache of heart, and pain of conscience, confirmation of insights, and glimpses of possibility; 4. to create and maintain a fellowship—a community of memory and hope—and to rally people around a banner of courage and confidence and evoke their loyalty to that which is universal and abiding; 5. to stimulate constructive and reconstructive service based on an understanding of contemporary conditions, on social imagination, and social criticism; 6. to train people in character, responsibility, decision, piety, morale, and to stimulate the nerve of that thing called faith; 7. and, finally, to accomplish this ministry skillfully through preaching, worship, music, teaching, counselling, and administration. 8. All this training should be carried on in the context of the living church, so that the student is never merely a spectator but always a participant; and in the context of personal religious devotion.

The particular emphasis any theological seminary lays on one or another of these several objectives will depend in part on the special gifts and personal power of faculty members and in part on the needs of the churches. If it be true that in recent years liberal theology has enlisted in its behalf ministers who have emphasized the intellectual aspects of religion, and if humanitarianism has opened for preachers visions of the social gospel, two special emphases would seem to be called for today to

redress the balance: 1. to make available for organized religion the insights and methods of the social sciences; and 2. to recover the almost lost art of the pastor or, in contemporary parlance, the art of counselling.

If theological schools which are in a position to train teachers are to measure up to their opportunity, they should take into account President Hutchin's proposal to distinguish between a Ph.D. for teaching and a Ph.D. for research. Much college teaching in religion is ineffective because the instructors got their advanced theological degrees in institutions where the ideal was the preparation of scholars rather than of teachers of religion.

Once a theological school has come into being, a subsidiary aim develops. Churches should be able to turn to these Schools for counsel on specific problems: how to deal with ecstatic cults, how to understand the invisible social currents that sway our ecclesiastical institutions, how to handle released time of public school children in weekday religious instruction, how to influence the philosophy and conduct of life of college students, etc. The churches themselves stand in need of criticism, too. Thus, the theological school may also act as the direct strengthener as well as critic of the organized Christian life about it.

Berkeley, California A. C. McGIFFERT, JR.

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

A THEOLOGICAL seminary has a threefold role to perform.

1. It is the function of a seminary to conserve and transmit the full Christian heritage. This it should do whether or not it belongs officially to a Christian denomination. No theological seminary can fulfill its true purpose if it considers itself to be simply an institute for religious research. To be a seminary in any vital sense is to be committed to the essential truth and authority of the Christian heritage. That does not mean, of course, that seminaries should take up an uncritical, still less, an idolatrous attitude towards this heritage. It does mean, however, that it should be able to assume that truth for mankind is enshrined in the Christian revelation and that, that being so, it is the function of the seminary to understand, to interpret, and to transmit that revelation. This task must be accomplished mainly by the lectures and literary endeavors of the professors, but to some extent also through a seminary organ of theological thought.

2. It is the function of a theological seminary to train pastors and teachers and such other full-time servants of the Church as the Church needs for the fulfillment of its spiritual task. Preparation of the Christian

pastor to discharge worthily his complex duties must ever be a primary concern of the seminary. The more the candidate for the ministry learns about God and man in theory and in practice, and the better he is prepared to translate his knowledge into living words and living deeds, the more adequately will the seminary fulfill its functions.

Let it never be forgotten, however, that it is no less important that the seminary should prepare teachers as well as preachers of Christianity. More and more should seminaries undertake the task, in collaboration if possible with secular colleges, to prepare men to teach the Christian religion wherever such teachers are needed. In the present situation it will become increasingly the task of seminaries to equip men to teach sociology, psychology, and philosophy with a Christian emphasis.

3. In the fulfillment of these two main functions it is important that the seminary should always maintain and do equal justice to the vertical and horizontal reference in all theological education. As I have expressed the matter recently:

> In recent generations in America seminaries have been of two main types. One type of seminary has been exclusively interested in breaking up the white light of revelation into its constituent facets. It has had little or no interest in the problems of contemporary people, nor has it shown the relevance of divine truth to the situation in which men and women live and move. The other type has been interested more or less exclusively in the problem of the horizontal, that is to say, the problems of man's life in society. In its classrooms theological thinking has not been based upon divine revelation. Theology has been little more than a department of sociology. What we need today is a union of these two types. The vertical and the horizontal emphases must intersect in a prophetic approach to the world of our time; the eternal must challenge the temporal.[1]

JOHN A. MACKAY

Princeton, New Jersey

UNITED COLLEGE

In western Canada the ever recurrent question is as to whether or not there will be a crop this year, and how large. That constitutes my *apologia* for answering in practical terms the question as to "the real purpose and aim of a theological seminary."

1. The theological seminary must give attention to seeing that the prospective theological student get the right kind of arts training. It may be of importance that he obtain a working knowledge of Hebrew and Greek. It is of greater importance that he have seen how man, down through the ages, learned to master the forces of nature, to adjust his conduct to life, express himself in law, government, and literature. If

[1] *A Preface to Christian Theology,* Macmillan.

the Church of today and tomorrow is to be the integrative factor it can and must be if a Christian civilization is to survive the present chaos, the future leaders of the Church must have an intelligent and comprehensive knowledge of the forces that have gone into the making of our present civilization.

2. The theologian no longer has to defer to science and philosophy to give scientific and philosophic validation to his Christian faith. Theology can again achieve the proud place it once held in the university along with law and medicine as it faces the facts with which it has to deal as honestly and frankly as the scientist examines his data. It must go further: it must join with science and philosophy in an endeavor to help man gain control over the whole universe and the more abundant life which man's inventive genius has opened up before him. Only by high academic standards, maintained in conjunctive with methods that are scrupulous in their demands for intellectual honesty, can the theological school assist its students to become, along with the Christian faith whose exponents they are, an effective force in contemporary society.

3. The theological school will see that its students acquire a clear picture of the situation, in country and city, where they must do their future work. One of the particular problems in the Province of Manitoba is that of population changes, whereby in recent years the leadership, so far as numbers go, has passed from the Anglo-Saxon group over to population groups whose background is mainly, and very recently, European. It is necessary that the future ministers of the Church should be led to see in the new situation a challenge to their statesmanship and an opportunity for a sympathetic approach to other churches whose traditions are other than theirs that together they may work in this new land for the realization of Christian and American democratic ideals.

There is the problem, too, of those poorly adjusted and starved personalities who accept so readily the aid offered by the sects. The theological seminary must introduce its students to a study of the inner and social forces that move men to action, that through the Church they may help such individuals to a satisfying individual and social adjustment to life and environment.

4. The laboratory method should be employed more widely in the theological seminary, and should not be confined to the departments of sociology and religious education. The summer mission field work of the students, and the week-by-week service carried on by so many of them in near-by fields during the term, should be analyzed and made a basis of class discussion. In this type of work the professors of the Old and New Testaments should participate. Indeed, in some of the class sessions

all the professors might be present and be faced with the questions and problems arising out of the field work of their students.

5. In saying all this, there is no implication that the seminary should cease to lay emphasis upon the traditional disciplines of theological study, nor neglect to emphasize such present developments as the ecumenical movement. It is, finally, my firm conviction that the seminary will have failed utterly if its students have left its halls with the ability to think accurately and with some competence for their tasks, but without a deepened religious faith and lacking the crusading spirit of the Master of the Church.

G. B. KING

Winnipeg, Manitoba

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO DIVINITY SCHOOL

THE DIVINITY SCHOOL of the University of Chicago has long conceived its task to be the education rather than the training of the minister. It therefore has rejected and continues to reject the "trade-school" definition of the seminary. It does not regard instruction in techniques and skills as its most important task, but it recognizes that a knowledge of them is indispensable, and is planning at the present time to enrich its curriculum in this area by giving the student extensive practical experience.

The Divinity School believes that the education of the theological student should have the aims both of transmitting a body of knowledge and of developing the capacity of the student. It feels under obligation to transmit to the student what scholarly study has learned of the Christian tradition in the realms of history, literature, and thought. At the same time, it tries to challenge the student by the presentation of the contemporary environment of the church—social, intellectual, and religious—because the historical and operative aspects of Christianity are organically related to each other. Its hope is that the student who knows well his Christian heritage and is at home in contemporary society may be guided in his own intellectual development to that capacity for independent action and thought which the sudden shifts in all the areas of life today demand of the religious worker.

The Divinity School is dedicated to the proposition that theological study today needs tougher quality in the fibre of its product. It welcomes, therefore, the stimulus and challenge which its students receive from its interdenominational character. It prizes its reputation as an expensive school. It intends to decrease the amount of tuition credits given to its students as theological students. It assumes that its students have received in college a thorough acquaintance with our cultural heritage and

the scientific knowledge of the present. Where they lack this, they will be sent into college courses to acquire it. The Divinity School purposes a larger inclusion of the resources of the University in its own work.

This seminary believes that the basic aim of seminary education is missed when the ministerial student is protected from anything. It is not education to build walls around him in the school which will not protect him in the pastorate. That conception of theological education which justifies limiting the intellectual nourishment to that which comes in denominational packages—or even in denominational packages of a certain color, or even in theological (*i.e.*, professional) packages—is repudiated. The student should know the enemy's arsenal as well as his own. Ignorance of the German Panzer divisions made even the Maginot line vulnerable. The Divinity School tries to educate its students in the atmosphere of the free pursuit of truth. The cloisters in Chicago are in the buildings, not in the teachers' minds.

Yet the Divinity School believes that the goal of theological education is attained only as the school preserves and deepens the religious motivation which initiated the study on the part of the individual student. Therefore, it constantly affirms its faith in the work of the Christian churches and its debt to them, and is striving now to increase the significance of its contact with them.

ERNEST CADMAN COLWELL

Chicago, Illinois

YALE UNIVERSITY DIVINITY SCHOOL

THE DIVINITY SCHOOL of Yale University provides: 1. graduate professional training for the Christian ministry, with a three-year curriculum leading to the B.D. degree, and 2. graduate study for students who already have the B.D. degree, leading to the S.T.M., M.A., and Ph.D. degrees. Of the 263 students at present enrolled in the School, 200 are candidates for the B.D., and 63 are engaged in the further graduate study which leads to higher degrees.

The members of the faculty of the Divinity School, except those responsible for such purely professional matters as homiletics, public worship, church administration, and the like, are also members of the faculty of the Graduate School of the University, serving in its departments of religion, religious education, Oriental studies, philosophy, and history. The aim of the Divinity School, at this level of its work, is like that of the other departments of the Graduate School—the cultivation of scholarship and the extension of knowledge. It is responsible for those fields of scholarship which are most closely cognate to Christian

theology and to the work of the Christian church—comparative religion, Old Testament, New Testament, history of Christianity, historical and contemporary theology, Christian ethics, and religious education. It seeks to develop sound scholars and competent teachers in these fields; and it assumes that the best method of directing the education of students to this end is for the members of the faculty to associate these students with themselves in the work of research, experiment, productive scholarship, and creative thinking and writing.

The curriculum for the B.D. degree is more complex than that of most denominational seminaries, as it provides for six distinct vocational groups: (A) the preaching ministry and pastoral service, (B) foreign missionary service, (C) religious education in church and school, (D) community service through religious agencies, (E) religious leadership in colleges and universities, (F) teaching and research in religion. Usually from two-thirds to three-fourths of the B.D. students are enrolled in group A, preparing for the preaching and pastoral ministry. Our aim for this group, broadly speaking, is to prepare the student for effective service in the Christian ministry.

The real curriculum of any school is more than the program of subjects taught in the classroom. It includes the whole life of the institution and the experiences which are fostered or left open to the student. The curriculum of a theological seminary is clearly to be described in these broad terms. It includes not only courses of study guided by classroom teaching, but also practice under supervision in various fields of ministerial service; the corporate life of the institution, including worship, social contacts, conditions of residence, provision for recreation, etc.; and the student's individual life and habits of study.

We are trying to make provision for all-round development of the student. Without any less emphasis upon academic study which is of graduate standard, we undertake also to supervise the students' field work in the interest of their education, to afford helpful conditions of residence, worship, and recreation, to give sound personal counsel, and to render prophylactic and constructive health service.

LUTHER A. WEIGLE

New Haven, Connecticut

THE ESSENCE OF CHRISTIANITY

EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN

Boston University

ANY thoughtful Christian must desire to know what Christianity is. Likewise, any thoughtful Christian must desire agreement with other Christians; there is no intrinsic merit in disagreement, much less in pride of opinion, and the practical values of agreement for human welfare and for common worship are obvious. Where truth is believed, there will be agreement. Disagreements among Christians are almost a scandal. Yet agreements forced on the basis that my view (whoever I am) is alone God's word are more scandalous.

Our thoughtful Christian might make some headway in defining what he himself conceives true Christianity to be; or, again, he might look for agreements among all Christians. But would the result of the first process bear much resemblance to the result of the second? Would a faith that fully satisfies my reason and conscience satisfy yours? Would what we all agree on be true Christianity or a thin dilution of it? Again, is it so easy to define exactly what we ourselves believe true Christianity to be, and to give adequate reasons? When groups of Christians come together, can they tell each other clearly and convincingly what their faith is? Ultimate presuppositions differ so radically that the very concept of one true Christianity seems almost to be an absurdity. At least, claim to knowledge of it seems absurd. Who is to decide for Roman Catholicism against Barthianism, or for humanistic against theistic Christianity? And if we cannot conclusively determine our own concept of true Christianity, then we cannot even begin to take the vote which would reveal to what extent Christians agree, for we cannot even determine who are the qualified voters. If, in our abashed humility, we leave it all to the divine word or the eternal decrees, then we have admitted that no human being can ever identify any item of his own faith as genuinely Christian. A priori, things look dark. Only God knows what a Christian is.

A posteriori, that is, historically, the outlook is not much brighter. Feuerbach and Harnack drew very different pictures of *Das Wesen des Christentums*. What Jesus taught, in so far as criticism can rescue the heart of it, was far from identical with the theology of Saint Paul or even with the simple Pentecostal preaching (*κήρυγμα*) of salvation by faith in Christ. As time went on, Christianity became a conflict of

Gnostics, Montanists, and Old Catholics; of Tertullian and authoritarianism with Clement and Greek philosophy, of Pelagius with Augustine, pope with Luther, Calvin with Arminius, Everett Edward Hale with Mary Baker Eddy, Karl Barth with John Dewey. And we are to seek for essential agreement in all this!

Is it fantastically impossible to look for the essence of Christianity apart from some arbitrary authority? Does Christianity have no definite meaning whatever? Is it an undefinable or a mere courtesy title—a supernatural mystery or a social form used to conceal the anarchic absence of all meaning? Does it mean only the kind thought, "I shall not slay you if you say you are a Christian"?

I

The Problem of the Criterion of Christianity

Before any assured answer can be given to the question which we have raised, it is necessary to consider the problem of the criterion of Christianity. How are we to test what is and what is not Christian?

Since Christianity is not a mathematical object, it cannot be adequately defined by an arbitrary set of postulates. Christianity, if it is anything, is an historical religion. Hence it must be defined as living historical movements are defined, not like pure abstract concepts of logic or mathematics.

How then, do we define historical movements? It is certain that no living process of any sort can be adequately defined by exclusive reference to its beginnings or to any one stage of its development. Origin does not determine meaning and value; origin does not define. This insight at once disposes of many suggested criteria of Christianity. For instance, the criterion could not be merely the literal teachings of Jesus, even if we knew what they were. Few Christians accept them all. Nor (for the same reason) could it be the New Testament or the entire Bible or the experiences of first century Christians. Without the total life stream of history flowing from Jesus, the Bible, and the first century, Christianity would not have become a religion—or at least, not the religion that we are now seeking to define. Thus Christianity is not an acorn; it is a growing oak. It is not the words of Jesus, but the power of Jesus in history. To be a Christian is not, primarily, to accept certain ideas, however true they may be; but, rather, it is to stand in actual relations to the life-stream of Christian history, a stream that flows from Jesus down to the present.

As an example, let us consider the view of those who, like Kraemer, appear to regard the Pauline doctrines as normative Christianity. If those doctrines are normative, was the historical Jesus a Christian? Was James? Luther was in doubt! Was John the Revelator? The early church hesitated. Many would insist that some sort of doctrinal agreement (whether Pauline or not) is of the very essence of Christianity. If it is, and Christianity is viewed as a system of revealed truths, how are we to escape the regimenting authority of Roman Catholicism or its Calvinistic surrogate?—its surrogate, that is, in the matter of authority. Within the New Testament there are patent differences; who knows what the formula, "Paul and Apollos," may have had hidden behind it? The antitheses of Paul and James, Synoptics and John, lie on the surface. The differences between Christian Platonists and Christian Aristotelians, between Catholic and Protestant, between Christian symbolists and Christian literalists, between theistic and naturalistic Christians are so vast as almost to preclude common understanding, to say nothing of agreement.

Yet who would care to deny the name of Christian to anyone who seeks to follow Jesus, regardless of divergences in interpretation? Does not anyone move in the Christian life-stream of history if he finds somewhere in the Christian Scriptures, especially in the records about Jesus, a source of supreme moral and religious inspiration?

II

Points of Conflict

The point of view just expressed is an *eirenikon,* and perhaps an oversimple one. No peace based on ignorance can endure. Actual Christianity has never been a simple peaceful agreement on following Jesus. There have been acute points of conflict, some of which we shall mention.

1. Harnack was quite right in distinguishing the gospel *of* Jesus from the gospel *about* Jesus. Professor W. H. P. Hatch has recently[1] pointed out the character of the early Christian κήρυγμα, the preaching of the day of Pentecost and of the first generation of Christians—called in the spurious ending of Mark "the sacred and incorruptible κήρυγμα of eternal salvation." The κήρυγμα did not consist of the teachings of Jesus, but rather was a proclamation of his sacrificial death on the cross and his resurrection for our redemption. "If Christ hath not been

[1] *Jour. Bib. Lit., LVIII* (1939), pp. 1-12.

raised, then is our κήρυγμα vain." "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved" (Acts 16:31). This is indeed a different world of thought from that of the Sermon on the Mount or the epistle of James. Morgan in the *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* holds that the verse just quoted is the earliest explicit statement of belief in revealed truth as the condition of salvation. Is Christianity primarily a metaphysical transaction based on an act of faith in dogma or is it primarily a "way" (ὁδός)? By what marks were the disciples known as such when they were first called Christians at Antioch? Were doctrine and life of coequal importance? Was life primary, as Jesus seemed to teach, or doctrine, as Paul appeared to teach?

2. A second point of conflict emerges for us today because of our historical methods of investigation. Criticism has rendered our knowledge of the teachings of Jesus so insecure and dubious that most critics deny that we can say with certainty exactly what Jesus taught about most points. If we follow Jesus, do we follow we know not what? Certain branches of the Church have been most meticulous in following the supposed teachings of Jesus on divorce, despite the conflicting textual tradition; yet, as far as I know, no church has adopted Christ's clear-cut definition of adultery in Matt. 5:28, "Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." The Church has preferred an uncertain tradition to a relatively certain one, because the certain one would be awkward to administer.

3. In spite of critical doubts let us assume that we know with reasonable certainty what Jesus taught, or at least the impression he made on the community that passed his spirit on to the later stream of history. Even then, the meaning of the simple formula of "following Jesus" is far from clear. Where the record tells of the command, "Follow me," it implies practical commitment rather than doctrinal agreement. "We left all and followed thee" (Mark 10:28). "Follow me; and let the dead bury their dead" (Matt. 8:22). "A man named Matthew sitting at the receipt of custom; and he saith unto him, Follow me. And he arose and followed him" (Matt. 9:9). To the rich young ruler, Jesus said, "Yet one thing thou lackest: sell all that thou hast and distribute unto the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, follow me" (Luke 18:22). Is following Jesus, then, merely a practical commitment to his movement and his person? Or is it also believing what he believed? He seems to have believed in Satan and demons, yet few liberal Christians would regard agreement with Jesus on this point as a test of the true Christian. Jesus rested his view partly on an appeal to "your sons." He seems to have shared and

reinterpreted the apocalyptic and eschatological hopes of a certain group of the Jews of his day. Yet, if Seventh Day Adventists and Crisis theologians agree on the vital importance of these beliefs of Jesus, many other Christians regard them as husk and not kernel, as historical accidents of the teachings of Jesus, not its spiritual centre. What of his view of his own person, and of the Heavenly Father? There are those who argue that if we follow Jesus in spite of rejecting his demonology and eschatology, we may also reject his Christology and theology and still follow him. What, then, does it mean to follow him?

4. A fourth point of conflict, which has been studied more seriously by German theologians than by most Anglo-Saxons, is the problem of Jesus *vs.* Paul. As the Christian movement developed, did Paul pass it on unchanged, or did he purify and elevate it, or was he a mystical legalist who debased its ethical core into something more like Pharisaism and Mohammedanism? Why does he say so little about the life and teachings of Jesus, apart from the so-called facts of salvation (*Heilstatsachen*)? Is Paulinism essential to Christianity, or only one of its passing phases?

These points of conflict are sufficiently contentious to make clear the difficulty of our task.

III

The Dialectic of the Unity of Christian Faith

Without considering in detail the history of doctrine, of schism and heresy, of religious wars, and of the conflicts of Christian faith with science and philosophy, we are now ready to face the problem of the essence of Christianity in all its apparent hopelessness. Facing it may be a long step toward a solution.

The situation is dialectical. The *thesis* runs: Following Jesus is impossible without ideas. The *antithesis* points out that following Jesus unitedly is impossible if we insist on agreement in ideas.

Let us examine this dialectical opposition. No one can reasonably deny that following Jesus is impossible without ideas. If no definition of "following Jesus" is available, no identification of Christians is available. There has been no religion, certainly no Christian religion, without a theology. The most anti-philosophical beliefs have still been beliefs. In this thesis we have the truth of the doctrinal tendencies of the Catholic Church from the earliest formulation of the Apostles' Creed down to the 1939 Encyclical of Pius XII to the American hierarchy in which he complains of a tendency in American colleges where "Christ is often despised or ignored [and] the explanation of the universe and mankind

is forced within the narrow limits of materialism or of rationalism." T. S. Eliot is not wholly wrong when, in *The Idea of a Christian Society,* he identifies Christianity with dogma. Jesus could not well avoid asking the Pharisees, "What think ye of Christ?" (Matt. 22:42), if he and they were to arrive at any mutual understanding. In the absence of any ideas, the best spirit is as empty and formal as are ideas without corresponding life. If following Jesus does not mean something specific, it is a meaningless phrase.

Father James B. Gallagher, O.S.A., in the Roman Catholic Cathedral of the Holy Cross in Boston, as reported in the Boston *Daily Globe* of March 3, 1940, said:

> Wearied by the religious anarchy of our times, men are striving on all hands to effect a reunion of the forces of Christendom. Praiseworthy as all the efforts at the restoration of a reunited Christianity may be, there is only one way that such a desirable result may be effected, and that is by a whole-hearted acceptance of a divinely instituted church, teaching with infallible authority the doctrine of the one infallible Christ.

When the thesis is thus carried to the extreme of Roman Catholic authoritarianism, it turns, for liberal minds, into the antithesis: Following Jesus unitedly is impossible if we insist on agreement in ideas. "Whole-hearted acceptance" of "infallible authority" of any kind is impossible for minds whose faith rests on a Protestant's conscience and whose criterion of truth is rational inquiry into growing experience. When Jesus said, "He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad" (Matt. 12:30), he was asserting the thesis. But when the disciples carried the thesis to the point of wanting to call down fire from heaven, Jesus, according to one reading, asserted the antithesis, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of" (Luke 9:55); and when they forbade the worker who "followeth not with us," his comment was: "Forbid him not: for he that is not against us is for us" (Luke 9:50). It is sure that we need to know "what manner of spirit" we are of; and equally sure that we must not, as Christians, confine the workings of that spirit to those who follow with us, whether we be Catholics or liberals, pragmatists or personalists, Barthians or activists.

Is there a *synthesis* of these dialectical opposites? If we tarry in the thesis, as Catholics or as Calvinists, we have authoritarianism. If we tarry in the antithesis, we have anarchy. If we move to a synthesis, we have Christian freedom, which is a genuine bond of unity. Christian freedom is the liberty of followers of Jesus combined with faith. The principle of this synthesis is that of following Jesus, yet freely inter-

preting his message, his doctrine, and his relevance to life, in loyalty to our best insights, whether they be Catholic or Protestant, theistic or humanistic. Jesus is then not a fixed model, but seed and soil and sun. Essential Christianity adds to this freedom, faith. First of all, there is the faith that we are moving toward a goal that Jesus sought, even when our ideas contradict the ideas of many other Christians. Then, there is the faith that agreement in doctrine, in the nature of the case, is to be sought as an ideal limit of investigation rather than as a present achievement. The inexhaustibility of the spiritual life is better conveyed by a New Testament that contains a Paul and a James, and an American church that contains a Wieman and a Hocking than it would be by the rigid uniformity of Father Gallagher's thesis or by the individualistic anarchy of the antithesis.

IV

Are There Any Ideas on Which Almost All Christians May Agree at All Stages of the Historical Dialectic?

If we look over the actual growth of Christianity and envisage its possible future growth, we find only one belief which it is a priori certain must always remain an essential, namely, the belief in following Jesus. Yet a consideration of the history of our religion reveals a considerable amount of further agreement, even between the most orthodox and the most heterodox. It appears that almost all who have rejected the letter have retained the spirit of a common Christianity at more points than we have been prone to suppose. The following points represent something approximating a common Christian faith in the goal of Jesus. The approximate character of the concepts must be emphasized, for we cannot precisely define the area in which disagreements remain Christian.

1. *Following Jesus.* First of all, as we have said repeatedly, the one vital essential to being a Christian is the desire to follow Jesus. Following Jesus does not mean believing everything that he taught or imitating his behavior. It means rather finding some of life's essential, saving values in or through him.

2. *Faith in divine initiative.* On the basis of the fundamental essential of following Jesus, we next seek the truth in the conceptions most precious to historical orthodoxy. In the doctrines of the divine institution of the church, the atonement, redemption, conversion, regeneration, sanctification, adoption—the doctrines which Paul at once illuminated and obscured by his figures of speech derived from Jewish and

Roman law—there is the common faith which comes to sublime expression in Francis Thompson's *The Hound of Heaven.* It is the faith in divine initiative. Man is a creature, dependent on a power unspeakably greater than he. Such aspiration to goodness as he feels could not have arisen in the first place, and, having arisen, could not have survived for his salvation, if the Greater Power were not a healing power which took the initiative in seeking his well-being. We have the treasure in very earthen vessels. No Calvinistic emphasis on the worthlessness of human works can obscure the truth that God actually elects and saves some souls on his sovereign initiative. No humanistic emphasis on naturalistic processes in spiritual growth can obscure the truth that man does not live in a vacuum, but is dependent for his spiritual welfare on adjustment to objective forces which sustain him in his search for values and which harbored the potentialities of that search long before he was born.

Let it, then, be clear that the essential faith in divine initiative is wide enough to include, on the one hand, faith in the atonement as a price paid to the devil for man's redemption, and on the other, faith in impersonal forces resident in nature which make for spiritual growth and value and emanate from nature in so far as it is or contains any object worthy of worship. The first recorded message of Jesus was the appeal: "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye, and believe the gospel." That the kingdom of God, the objective initiative of divine forces, is at hand is an essential of Christian faith, if we are to judge from the history. No one who has wholly denied it has cared to call himself Christian. Pelagians, Arminians, Unitarians, humanists, and naturalists, in so far as they have felt themselves to be Christians, have held to the essential faith in a divine initiative.

3. *Humility.* Humility is a virtue characteristically Christian. "Blessed are the meek; blessed are the poor in spirit." It is true that ὕβρις (wanton insolence) is a vice for Greeks, as is pride for Christians; but the Greeks inferred that the proper course for man was mediocre inconspicuousness rather than humility. The Christian sense of dependence on the divine, and of the consequent tension between a sense of the absolute dependence and the absolute value of the soul, has made Christian humility an almost unique religious ideal, shared as ideal, if not as achievement, by Christians at every stage of the history.

A peculiar phenomenon, resulting from an exaggeration of the uniqueness of this virtue, is the Barthian attack on "the pride of reason," as if reason were somehow hostile to humility. There is no doubt that there is such a vice as dogmatic pride of opinion; yet it is an aberration

to connect it with reason. Barthians lack any clear view of what reason is, and Barthians are not alone in this. The true spirit of reason is essentially the spirit of Christian humility engaged in the search for truth. Reason is not proud; it is open to correction, submissive to experience, eager for light, conscious of incompleteness. If reasoners have been proud, so have Christian believers; but pride is equally unreasonable and unchristian. Theologians as a class are not notably humbler than philosophers. But where either has failed, the defect has been in the man's weakness, not in the nature of reason or of Christian faith. Humility may be said to be in a sense the most rational of the Christian virtues. Love of God and love of truth are at bottom indistinguishable; at least, the follower of Jesus will hope and believe that they are indistinguishable. If he distrusts rational love of truth, it will not be because of his Christian humility, but because of a proudly human distrust of God's ability to protect himself from free investigation, which amounts to a paternalistic protectorate over deity. Yet even where this unchristian and irrational vice exists, the virtue of humility is still honored in the breach as well as in the observance.

4. *The spiritual value of sacrifice and suffering.* It is safe to say that no one at any stage of Christian development has ever read the story of Good Friday and of Easter without seeing in it the drama of faith in the spiritual value of sacrifice. Out of voluntary submission to undeserved suffering come resurrection and redemption. Here is a universal faith essential to all Christians everywhere. He who sees all suffering as wholly evil or hopelessly bad, and rebelliously demands a life of pure pleasure, is no Christian. The follower of Jesus should not say, and usually does not say, that suffering is in itself a good. It is truly an evil; yet it is an evil that can be conquered. Did not Christ conquer it for our salvation? May not we, through him, endure and overcome? In this Christian essential we have something very different from the attitude toward suffering in most Oriental religions, especially in Buddhism. Christianity is essentially a religion of redemption through sacrifice and suffering, however the theological interpretations of this redemption may differ from each other and however revolting the hymnology of "a fountain filled with blood" may be to refined sensibilities. After all, reality is more bloody than refined, and overdelicate souls miss the graver aspects of truth.

5. *Self-respect.* Christians agree almost unanimously with their Master's evaluation of the individual human personality. Jesus taught that, as every sheep is precious to the good shepherd, so every soul is precious to God. In this preciousness of the individual to God he

founded the preciousness of the individual to himself. Christian self-respect is no doctrine of selfishness, no war of all against all. On the other hand, unlike Buddhism, Christianity is a religion of self-valuation. "Thou shalt love they neighbor as thyself" is a fundamental Christian essential, if following Jesus means anything at all. "As thyself" means that the root virtue is respect for personality in one's own self. Without this qualification, humility ceases to be humble, and becomes "'umble"; for the dignity of Christ is substituted the loathsome "I am so 'umble" of Uriah Heep. Christian self-respect was summarized by the scribe in his account of true love of God, "with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength" (Mark 12:33). Christian self-respect requires the utmost endeavor of all the powers of the soul. It is exemplified not only by a socially responsible sense of being the light of the world (Matt. 5:14), but equally by prayer in secret (Matt. 6:6). It is Christian to "lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven" (Matt. 6:20), because self-respect demands the highest values. In some form—often, it is true, disguised and perverted—the self-respect of the soul is part of the universal heritage of all Christians.

6. *Respect for all persons.* Jesus treats self-respect as a basis for respect for all persons. The Golden Rule indicates this. The maxim of treating all persons as ends in themselves, never as means only, is no invention of Immanuel Kant. Although not unique in Christianity any more than in Kant, it is essential to Christianity. Men universally respect a religious believer who puts this maxim into practice, and see in his act something that partakes of the divine. This is too obvious to need elaboration.

7. *Love for all persons.* At the cost of seeming to spin out the Golden Rule overminutely, the principle of love is added to that of respect for all persons. Love, as a wider principle, includes respect; yet love is exclusively social, whereas respect is properly directed toward both the *ego* and the *alter*. Furthermore, the teaching of the attitude of love toward one's enemy is perhaps the loftiest and most characteristic of Christian moral insights. "God is love" (*ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν*—I John 4:8, 16) summarizes the universality of Christian love at its highest religious point. However much the followers of Jesus have found it necessary to interpret, to qualify, or to add to this faith, it is safe to say that no follower of Jesus has intentionally denied it. *Ἀγάπη* (love) is a Christian essential, regardless of whether Nygren's exact concept of it be accepted or rejected.

8. *Coöperation with man and God.* With the concept of coöperation

we take a further step in the definition of the Christian *ethos*. As love is more than respect, so coöperation, if not more than love, is at least to be distinguished from it, as expression is distinguished from attitude. Love for all persons is an attitude; coöperation is the expression of that attitude. In the teaching, "be reconciled with thy brother," the keynote of Christian coöperation is struck. Shortly after the day of Pentecost, "All that believed were together and had all things common" (Acts 2:44). However apologetic some Christians may be about this tendency toward economic radicalism in the early Christian community, and however alert they may be to note that this particular "noble experiment" was an ethical, if not an economic failure, it remains true that the spirit of concrete coöperation then exhibited is one of the most persistent traits of essential Christianity—always in faith, often in practice. Witness the modern Christian interest in coöperatives.

Plato viewed God as a laborer (*ὁ δημιουργός*, the demiurge, the artisan, the laborer for the people); it remained for Paul to group man and God together as fellow laborers (*συνεργοι*). Although the conception of man's coöperation with God as necessary to "salvation" is offensive to some types of theology, yet no Christian has in practice believed that his religion consisted entirely of faith in the divine initiative without any obligation to response on his own part. The solitary Christian seemed impossible to John Wesley and is indeed contrary to the essence of Christianity. Some Christians have overemphasized coöperation with the divine; some, coöperation with the human. But no Christian has in any real sense denied either aspect of coöperative religion.

The coöperative nature of Christianity is further illustrated by the historic development of the church. It is true that Christians, under pressure, have at times tended to restrict their coöperative activities too narrowly to fellow members of the Christian community. "Let us do good," wrote Saint Paul, "unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith" (Gal. 6:10). In this utterance one wishes for a saving negative—"especially unto them who are *not* of the household of faith." Then Paul would have been closer to the parables of the lost sheep and the lost son, as well as to the teaching that Christians are to be light, leaven, and salt to the whole of society. Yet Paul's deviation from the level of Jesus was not a rejection of the ideal of coöperation. It was rather an administrator's perception of practical exigencies in its application. Prayer, especially the Lord's Prayer, with its petitions, "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven," illustrates the coöperative essence of Christianity. If

one word besides "following Jesus" were to sum up total Christianity, it might well be the word "coöperation."

9. *The reality of change.* From the first proclamation of Jesus, "Repent ye, and believe the gospel" (Mark 1:15), Christians have held to the reality of change. This insight has assumed many forms other than the simple demand for repentance (*μετάνοια*). The doctrines of regeneration, the new birth, and sanctification, all embody the same conviction. The Christian is a changed man. First, that which is natural; then, that which is spiritual. Whether the change is gradual, like the growth of the mustard seed, or sudden, like Paul's conversion, the experience of a Christian is an experience of spiritual change.

The importance of change for Christianity was pointed out acutely a few years ago by the late Professor David F. Swenson of the University of Minnesota. At a meeting of the Eastern Division of the American Philosophical Association, Professor Morris R. Cohen had read a brilliant paper on Spinoza, dwelling on Spinoza's evaluation of the eternal and the changeless. Professor Swenson's comment was to the effect that however conceivable and sublime Spinoza's view might be, it was plainly not Christian, for the simple reason that Christianity asserts change as well as the changeless, and makes change more fundamental. Change in man—conversion—and change in God—change in his activity of revelation, if not in his fundamental purposes—are essentials of Christian faith.

Change in man we have illustrated. Change in God is required by the two covenants, the progressive revelation, and the crucial importance of the life and work of Jesus for God as well as for man. The reality of change may be said to be Part I of the Christian Philosophy of History. Real change, not the treadmill of endlessly self-repeating cycles, is a basis of the Christian view of experience.

10. *Hope.* Faith in the reality of change leads naturally to hope. It is fair to say that the Christian stress on sin and redemption is a fact that makes all thoughtless and light-hearted optimism unchristian. If all is now perfect, and evil is illusory, then, as a philosophical absolutist once remarked, "Why all this zeal for reform? The universe is already perfect." The Christian view is quite other. Demons must be cast out, souls saved from hell, the cross borne in daily life, persecutions endured. Every true Christian has been dissatisfied with the world as it is and with himself as he is. No one can try to follow Jesus and remain a shallow optimist.

On the other hand, Christianity has also rejected pessimism. Its faith in the dignity of personality and in the spiritual value of sacri-

fice and suffering have always kept Christians from pessimistic despair. Saint Paul would not have enjoyed Schopenhauer's applause of his picture of how "the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now" (Rom. 8:22). The point is that for Schopenhauer the groaning and the travail were the whole truth; for Paul they were but the setting for the climax in which God "giveth us the victory" (I Cor. 15:57); we are saved, Paul says, by hope (Rom. 8:24). Thus Christianity, in its origins and in its historical development, likewise, has been a meliorism rather than either an optimism or a pessimism. The Christian is always hoping for something better which he believes will come, whether in such wise as is intimated in the eschatological myths, or by the immanence of spiritual power in history. Hope, symbolized in the resurrection faith and in every spiritual commitment, is a Christian fundamental. A person who wholly despairs ceases in that very act to be a Christian.

In this principle of hope we have Part II of a Christian Philosophy of History. The Christian has no illusions about a steady forward movement in history. His hope is not for a straight road up the mountain of virtue to the kingdom of God on earth. But whether the road be straight or devious, and whether its goal is to be reached partly on this earth or only in heaven, the Christian's road is one that he travels with hope because of his faith in the leader he is following. John Dewey is not far from this Christian essential when he defines religion as "a sense of the possibilities of existence and as devotion to the cause of these possibilities" (*The Quest for Certainty,* p. 303). The Christian's hope is based on God's inexhaustible possibilities for man.

V

Concluding Remarks

Such are at least some of the essentials of Christianity which have survived through the centuries. They might be summarized as:

1. Faith in Jesus;
2. Faith in divine initiative and human dependence (2 and 3 above);
3. The spiritual value of suffering;
4. Faith in personality and personal coöperation (5, 6, 7, 8 above);
5. Hope, based on the reality of change (9 and 10 above).[2]

Some will doubtless say that this is a denatured Christianity—one in which no metaphysical view of God or Jesus is essential, one in

[2] These figures refer to the subheads of section IV.

which theological realism is watered down. It may be condemned as rationalistic or moralistic.

Yet if this be not accepted as a true picture of the essentials of historic Christianity, it will be necessary to adopt a totally different method from the one we have pursued. Our attempt has been to define Christianity by seeking for beliefs and attitudes held in common throughout the Christian history by all followers of Jesus. Our definition of essentials has therefore been empirical, not ideally normative or metaphysical.

As a matter of empirical fact, Christians do (it seems to me) agree on the items mentioned as a minimum platform. If this agreement be rejected as an inadequate basis for definition, then we must turn to some selective and authoritarian principle for our definition, in which case our definition is inevitably divisive in its effects. Even if it be based on a rational appeal to the evidence for some specific system of theology or philosophy, is there not danger that departure from the broad historical basis will lead, as it has led, to insistence on special dogmas as essential, dogmas often thought of as transcending both experience and reason? Is it not true that insistence on orthodoxy itself may be schismatic in the Christian community? Has not emphasis on revelation or mystical experience often led, as in scholasticism, to the assertion *that* God is, accompanied by complete ignorance about *what* God is? Has not Calvinism presented us with a concept of God almost equally remote from experience and history? If any of these tendencies are made normative for essential Christianity, will this not alienate all who turn away from Nirvana and Islam as the essence of religion?

Suppose one has to choose between two extremes. Let Eduard von Hartmann represent one of these extremes:

> The redemption of the world through Christ comes to pass through this, that all men follow him in despising the world, and in living in faith and hope of a hereafter. . . . This is the historical and only important content of the doctrine preached by Jesus.[3]

Then let Max C. Otto represent the other extreme. In his book, *The Human Enterprise*,[4] Professor Otto distinguishes between cosmic and ethical theism, and corresponding types of atheism. He commits himself to ethical theism, as he calls it, and cosmic atheism. He ardently condemns those who "talk the words of cosmic theism and act the deeds of ethical atheism" (p. 314). As between these two extremes, which is the more truly Christian? I for one do not hesitate to say that Max

[3] *Philosophy of the Unconscious*, London, 1884, Vol. III, p. 80.
[4] New York, F. S. Crofts & Co., 1940.

Otto's position comes far closer to the essential spirit of a follower of Jesus than does Eduard von Hartmann's. The essence of Christianity, as of all true religion, is practical. Jesus emphasized fruits. He was fiercely and practically radical when he summarized the parable of the two sons called to work in the vineyard by the remark, "The publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you" (Matt. 21:31).

If an atheistic humanist is by our test a better Christian than a pessimistic, otherworldly metaphysician, we are led to see clearly the limitations of any search for the essence of Christianity. The essence of any long historical development must necessarily turn out to be an abstraction as compared with the vital developing life itself. Instead of being surprised at the diluted moralism and rationalism of our results, we should be rather surprised at finding so much on which we can agree. After all, our definition includes Oxford groupers and Barthians, Christian Scientists and Roman Catholics, theists and atheistic humanists.

But it must be added that the concept of historical essence is not identical with a concept of exhaustive or paramount truth. In fact, as long as the human spirit exists it will engage in an unceasing quest for new truth. Hence, deviations from the historical essence of any movement are to be expected; in time, reinterpretations, additions, criticisms may themselves become historical essence. Christianity would be thin and feeble if it were rigidly restricted to the confines of the area which we have defined. It will be deepened and chastened by every challenge, by every metaphysical and theological advance. No good would come of setting down the essence as defined and making it a new ecumenical creed—if that were possible. Yet perhaps the points mentioned will be serviceable because of their definition of an area of enduring common Christian faith, within which all Christians may recognize their fellowship, yet within which growth and reinterpretation will always go on.

THE METRICAL STRUCTURE OF II KINGS 19:20-28

THEOPHILE J. MEEK
University of Toronto

Our knowledge of Hebrew metrical structure is by no means complete, but it has advanced far enough to be a usable and most useful tool in the hands of the textual critic, provided he uses it with due discretion. It is the purpose of this paper to illustrate its use in the case of II Kings 19: 20-28. This particular passage is chosen because it is found in a slightly different version in Isa. 37: 21-29 and the variants there ought to help us solve the textual problems of the passage, while these problems in turn are of such a nature as to illustrate in striking fashion how a knowledge of Hebrew metrical structure can assist in their solution.

Even a casual glance through the passage, as set up in Kittel's edition of the text,[1] will show at once that the dominant meter is the *qinah*, and it is to be taken for granted that this meter runs all through the poem. In a short poem like this Hebrew regularly has but one kind of meter and not a mixture, as might be possible in English poetry. As is well known, the normal structure of a line in the *qinah* meter is a stichos of three beats, followed by a slight pause or cæsura, and then another stichos of two beats; *i. e.*, the rhythm is 3:2. It is to be noted at once, however, that occasional variants of this rhythm are 2:3 and 2:2, as I have shown conclusively elsewhere,[2] and both these variants appear in the present poem, as well as another (the tristich), which will be noted presently in our discussion of vs. 27. When parallelism is so basic to Hebrew poetic structure and is itself so often irregular, absolutely exact regularity in rhythm is not to be expected. Much of English poetry is anything but regular in its rhythm, so why should we expect and demand a different structure in Hebrew, where the stress or metrical accent is the structural element, even as it usually is in English poetry? Very exact regularity is forced and stilted, and all the great poets have broken away from it.[3] In Hebrew poetry there was less restraint than in most, and at best we have a tendency only to regularity and seldom one that is

[1] *Biblica Hebraica*, edited by R. Kittel. The text as it appears in the first and second editions will be used as the basis of this study.

[2] See "The Structure of Hebrew Poetry," in *Journal of Religion*, IX (1929), pp. 544 ff.; cf. also pp. 537 ff.

[3] In this connection it is of interest to note that the later editions of Shakespeare have a much more regular versification than the earlier ones, an indication that the editors of Shakespeare have been regularizing his poetry, even as biblical scholars would regularize that of the Hebrews.

long sustained. With these things in mind we come to our analysis of the poem, II Kings 19:20-28.

COMMENTARY

Vs. 20. This verse, together with the first half of the following, is of course the prose introduction to the poem and gives its setting.

Vs. 21. There is no difficulty here. The first line of the poem is clearly 2:2, or 2:3 if one deletes the hyphen from the last two words, and the second line is 3:2, and the parallelism is between the lines rather than the stichoi, as is usual with the *qinah* meter. The verbs are in the stative perfect, or perhaps better, the perfect of certainty.

Vs. 22. The second line of this verse is clearly 3:2, but the first line looks like 3:3, which strikes a note of discord here, because the 3:3 rhythm cannot be a variant of the *qinah*. The solution of the problem is to hyphenate קול with the preceding word to make a single stress-group or foot. The two words represent a single idea ("to raise the voice" is simply a Semitism for "to speak"), and since parallelism of ideas is basic to Hebrew poetry, a foot must express a complete idea and not a partial one, and so the two words must be combined here.[4]

Vs. 23. In this verse we come to the first serious difficulties in the poem. In place of ברכב "in riding," which makes no sense here, Isaiah and the ancient versions have the correct ברב "with the multitude." Rather oddly Isaiah has עבדיך "your servants" in place of מלאכיך "your messengers," showing that ancient copyists were not always concerned to get the exact words of the original, but sometimes, more or less unconsciously, substituted synonyms, as here. Similarly, later in the verse Isaiah has the synonym מבחר in place of מבחור, and it has מרום "height" in place of מרון "lodging place, shelter, retreat." These words are not synonymous, but in the present context the substitution of the one for the other makes no material difference in the sense, showing once again that ancient copyists were no more accurate in their work than their modern descendants. Hence we are not to be surprised that there are scribal errors in the Hebrew text; we are rather to be surprised that they are as few as they are. In place of the archaic form, קצה, the Isaiah copyist substituted the accepted form of his time, קצו. Both in Kings and Isaiah the last two verbs of the verse are written with simple *waw*, where later usage would require the *waw* consecutive. We should probably make the change here, as the Septuagint, Lucian, and the Vulgate indicate, but it is possible to interpret the imperfect verbal forms as archaisms preserving the early preterit, which disappeared from Hebrew

[4] Cf. further on this point Meek, *op. cit.*, pp. 538 ff.

in the course of time, but was retained in Akkadian throughout its history. In that case the final *ā*-ending of ואבואה in Kings would have to be interpreted as the emphatic ending, so common in Akkadian. If *waw* consecutives are read, we will have to read ואבוא with Isaiah, deleting the ending in Kings as a scribal error.

When we come to the metrical structure of the verse, our difficulties are more serious. The last two lines are quite regular (3:2, 3:2), but it is apparent at once that the Kittel arrangement of the first two lines is definitely wrong. The first line must end with ותאמר and the cæsura must come after מלאכיך, to make the line 2:3, which is simply a variant of the more usual 3:2, as we have already noted. This leaves two words in Kittel's first line which have to be added to his second line, to make eight words in all here, which are either too many or too few for the meter. Manifestly too few. Hence we have to look to the versions for the words that have dropped out, and we find them at once in that important witness to the original Hebrew, Lucian's recension of the Septuagint. In this we find the words עשיתי חיל immediately following אני, and their restoration here immediately makes our meter perfect, in two lines (2:3, 3:2):

ברב רכבי אני עשיתי חיל
עליתי מרום הרים ירכתי לבנון

Vs. 24. The Kittel arrangement of the first line of this verse does not put the cæsura in the right place. The sense requires that it should come after קרתי, to make a 2:3 line, and this is where the Massoretes put it. The Kittel arrangement is due to the preconceived notion, currently but incorrectly held, that the *qinah* meter must always be 3:2. In Isaiah זרים is omitted, showing how easy it was for a scribe to overlook a word, or even two words, as he did in the preceding verse. The last verb of the verse is written with simple *waw*, just as the last two in the preceding verse were, and like them it too ought probably to be written with *waw* consecutive, to give the imperfect the force of a perfect, which must be interpreted here as the perfect of certainty, since Sennacherib never actually got into Egypt but is here boasting of what he will do when he does get there. For metrical reasons כל must be hyphenated with the following word, to make a single stress-group. The last word מצור, as pointed by the Massoretes, strictly means "siege, siegeworks," but the word is clearly to be pointed מִצּוֹר, the exact Hebrew equivalent of cuneiform *Miṣṣaru*, "Egypt."

Vs. 25. Once again the Kittel arrangement puts the cæsura at the wrong place in the first line. The hyphen should be deleted after הלא

and the cæsura should come after שמעה, to make another 2:3 line. In the second line *waw* needs to be taken away from ויצרתיה, where it is grammatically impossible, and prefixed to עתה, where it rightfully belongs; and this is confirmed by the reading of Lucian, the Vulgate, and the Peshitto. The third line of the verse would seem to be too long, since there are four words, making apparently four feet, in the first stichos and two in the second. The first word is certainly suspect. It is the simple *waw* plus what looks like the apocopated imperfect, but this is an impossible construction in Hebrew, since the apocopated imperfect can only appear with the *waw* consecutive, and to read the *waw* consecutive here, as most scholars do, gives a tense which the context shows to be wrong. The word could easily have arisen by dittography from the last letters of the preceding word, which are almost identical with it. If the word is retained, it will have to be interpreted as simple *waw* plus the second singular jussive, to express the desiderative idea, "that you should be,"[5] and metrically it will have to be joined with the following word, to make a single foot. The objection to this is that the two words express separate ideas and accordingly ought not to be joined to make a single stress-group. Hence it would seem better to delete it. It is quite unnecessary to the sense and its presence can easily be explained as due to dittography, as already noted, or it could have been added by a scribe who wished to make the wording of the clause more explicit, since the infinitive by itself, which follows, does not indicate person, but is impersonal. The form of this infinitive, להשות, is due to the syncope of א and is found in its fuller form in Isaiah. If ותהי is deleted, the infinitive must be interpreted grammatically as standing in apposition to the suffix *–hā*, "it," attached to the two preceding verbs.

Vs. 26. In the first line the hyphen must be deleted from קצרי-יד, since the two words thus united express separate ideas and ought accordingly to be separate feet. In place of ויבשו, *waw* consecutive with the imperfect, Isaiah has simple *waw* with the perfect, which is equally correct grammatically[6] and shows us once again that the scribe did not feel absolutely bound to reproduce the original in all its details. The *waws* with יבק and שרפה may be interpreted as explicative, "namely," or emphatic, "even, yea," but their reproduction is rather awkward in English and not altogether necessary. In place of שרפה Isaiah by a slight error has שרמה "field," which makes no sense here. The last word of the verse must clearly be pointed, with the Vulgate, קָמָה, in place of the incorrect קָמָה

[5] The verb "to be" followed by an infinitive construct with *lamedh* is one form of the desiderative in Hebrew; cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch, *Hebrew Grammar* (26th ed.), p. 365 *h*. The construction is made still more emphatic here by the use of the jussive form of "to be."

[6] See, *e.g.*, Davidson, *Hebrew Syntax* (2nd ed.) p. 84 *a*.

of the Massoretes, whose pointing is sometimes strangely inaccurate, as it is here. The Massoretes were right, however, in placing the cæsura after גנות, to make the meter of the line 2:3, as against the Kittel arrangement of 3:2, which separates ושרפה from the words to which it belongs.

Vs. 27. In this verse it is apparent at once that קְמָךְ has dropped out at the beginning since the phrase that follows is incomplete without it, as all other occurrences show (cf. Gen. 19:33, 35; Deut. 6:7; 11:19; Ps. 139:2), and the meter requires it. The word is all but identical with the one immediately preceding it and was lost through haplography. With its restoration the meter of the line becomes quite correct, 2:3:2 (hyphenating ואת with the following word). This is a tristich in place of the normal distich, but the addition of an extra stichos was a fairly common practice of the Hebrew poet.[7] The extra stichos, here, however, is so nearly identical with the following stichos that it may well be due to dittography, but it is probably to be retained as necessary to lead up to the thought of the following verse.

Vs. 28. Since יען is a particle, it is not to be given a beat;[8] thus the first line of this verse is to be read 2:3. The second line is quite regular, 3:2, and the last line is 2:2, the second of this kind to appear in the poem. The other is the first line of the poem, and its appearance at the beginning and at the end may well have been intentional on the part of the poet. The author of our poem was a real poet. He chose exactly the right meter to express the irony and satire of his thought and he used it with a master hand, the general effect of which is not altogether lost even in a translation.

TRANSLATION[9]

20 Then Isaiah, the son of Amoz, sent word to Hezekiah:
"Thus says Yahweh, the God of Israel: 'What you have prayed to me concerning Sennacherib, king of Assyria, I have heard.'
21 This is the word which Yahweh has spoken against him:

'She despises you, laughs at you—
the virgin daughter of Zion!
Behind you she wags the head—
the daughter of Jerusalem!

[7] See Meek, *op. cit.*, pp. 533 ff.

[8] See Meek, *op. cit.*, p. 539.

[9] In order to bring out the metrical structure of the original the second stichos of each line (and likewise the third in vs. 27) is not written as a separate, parallel line, as is regularly done, but is deeply indented to the right of the first stichos.

22 Whom have you insulted and blasphemed?
Against whom have you raised your voice,
And lifted up your eyes on high?
Against the Holy One of Israel!
23 By the hand of your messengers
you have insulted the Lord and said:
"With the multitude of my chariots
I created an army;
I ascended the highest mountains,
the recesses of Lebanon;
Yea, I felled its tallest cedars,
its choicest cypresses;
And I entered its remotest retreat,
its densest thicket.
24 I dug down
and drank foreign waters;
And with the soles of my feet I will dry up
all the streams of Egypt."
25 Have you not heard
how I prepared it long ago,
How I devised it in days of old,
and now have brought it to pass—
That fortified cities should be blasted
into ruined heaps,
26 While their inhabitants, shorn of strength,
are dismayed and confounded,
Are become grass of the field,
yea, tender green grass,
Grass on the housetops,
blasted before it has grown up!
27 Your rising and sitting,
your going and coming I know,
and also your raging against me.
28 Because you have raged against me
and your arrogance has ascended to my ears,
Therefore I will put my hook in your nose
and my bridle in your lips,
And I will make you return by the way
by which you came.' "

THE POPULAR RELIGION OF GREECE AND ITS SURVIVALS

WALTER WOODBURN HYDE
University of Pennsylvania

THE STUDY of the religion of ancient Greece is usually approached by one of two methods: the anthropological, of finding primitive elements, which results in regarding it as the outgrowth of primitive nature religion; or the philological, of discovering religious ideas in the extant classical literature. Both methods, however, have given an inadequate picture of what Greek religion really was. The former, represented by such scholars as Jane Harrison and Sir James Frazer, has overlooked the fact that the primitive elements were constantly metamorphosed by higher ones through the pervasive influence of urban Greek civilization, and so were mere survivals into the historical period; while the latter, represented by such investigators as James Adam and Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, has neglected almost entirely the popular aspects of religion as being on a lower and therefore less important level than that reflected in art and literature. There is, however, a third method of approach, that by way of the popular beliefs, which is only beginning to attract the attention of scholars, notably that of Martin Nilsson, the Swedish philologist, archæologist, and historian of Greek religion, whose recent book, *Greek Popular Religion*,[1] is almost a pioneer effort to appraise seriously this phase of the subject, based on a study of the Greek cults, literary records, and especially archæological discoveries of inscriptions and monuments.

Greece in antiquity was an agricultural and pastoral country as it is yet today when perhaps three-fourths of the population are so employed, though only a fifth of the land is arable. The country folk then were backward and little influenced by the thought of the urban centres, just as they are today when they still use a wooden plough of Hesiodic pattern and have no idea of rotation of crops or of the use of fertilizers. Yet it was here in the backward countryside that Greek religion had its origin and early development and began to influence the religion of the commercial and industrial townsmen. Unfortunately, historians have regarded the popular beliefs and religious customs as folklore and superstition despite the fact that these always formed an

[1] Columbia University Press, New York, 1940. It comprises his lectures recently delivered in the United States before academic circles and sponsored by the American Council of Learned Societies. I have freely used the material in the present essay.

integral part of religion, and that, in fact, down to the advent of Christianity there was little distinction between religion and folklore such as exists today. The great gods, their cults and festivals, arose here, though these gods are presented to us magnified by literature and art. And it was here that various social and moral ideas were gradually added to the developing faith. The people kept primitive elements longer than the town dwellers, though this does not mean that the popular faith was identical with primitive religion. Greek religion, like every other, depended on conditions of life and changed as these did. And we should remember that two great forms of European poetry, the dramatic and bucolic, were products of the countryside and owed much to popular aspects of religion.

Moreover, it was these primitive beliefs and superstitions rather than the religious sentiments expressed by literary and artistic Greece which, while not the highest, have proved to be the more persistent. They have not utterly vanished through Christianity, but many of them have survived in modern folklore and in the rites of the Eastern Church. Christianity easily vanquished belief in the major gods and their cults, since that belief had been undermined for centuries by philosophies and Oriental cults, the latter of which supplied the people with religious fervor which was lacking in the old faith. Consequently, only a few scattered remnants of belief in the great gods can be found among the Greek people of today, of Zeus, Poseidon, Artemis, Demeter, Aphrodite, Apollo. Thus the nature functions of the weather-god Zeus—lightning, thunder, and rain—were easily transferred to the Christian God. Some deities have reappeared in the guise of Christian saints, sometimes through mere identity of names, *e.g.,* St. Demetra, formerly revered at Eleusis, representing Demeter, or St. Artemidos, who has taken over attributes of Artemis, whose ancient epithet *Kalliste* has survived as "the beautiful lady" in various parts of Greece. Still others have reappeared in the attributes of saints of different names. Thus Poseidon is now represented by St. Nicholas, patron saint of mariners, and Aphrodite and Hera by St. Catharine, patroness of marriage and love.

But the church could not so easily get rid of the lesser powers, the dæmons, heroes, etc., though it contemptuously regarded them as mere superstitions, for these lay deeper in the popular imagination than the faraway gods. Many of these live in the Greece of today, belief in them forming a kind of cryptic paganism under the guise of Christianity. Such spirits are now called by many names—*ta 'xotica* or *hoi exothen,* "outsiders," *i.e.,* non-Christian beings, or simply *ta pagana,* "pagan powers." Again they are euphemistically known as *ta 'pizela,* the

"enviable" or "happy ones," as on the island of Tinos, or *hoi kalotychoi,* "the fortunate" or "blessed ones," as in Epirus. They are also known as *stoicheia.* Plato called the four basic elements of matter assumed by the Ionian philosophers by this name, and later the term was transferred to the spirits which were supposed to animate them. St. Paul in contempt used the phrase, "the weak and beggarly elements" (Gal. 4:9), where "elements" (*stoicheia*)—A.R.V. "rudiments"—refers to such spirits. The common people identified them with local spirits or genii and so the word has been popularized in this sense. Such spirits have been classified by modern scholars in five groups according to their supposed habitats — buildings, mountains and caves, water, air, and guardian angels, all of which have their prototypes in antiquity. Some of these we shall discuss in the course of this survey.

There are also beliefs and institutions, such as ideas of the hereafter and festivals, embedded in the Eastern Church, which can be traced to a Greek rather than to a Palestinian origin. For the Church has been influenced not only in its theology by Greek philosophy, but in its beliefs, ritual, and hagiology by Greek religion, which has left behind *disiecta membra* of its former faith. Christianity in Greece as elsewhere in its early expansion over the Roman Empire owed its success, in part at least, to accepting and assimilating irresistible pagan ideas rather than trying to obliterate them. Such elements are so ingrained in the Greek mind that adherents of the Orthodox Church are both Christian and pagan at the same time and are unconscious of any contradiction.

It is one of the pleasures of travel in Greek lands today to meet unexpectedly such survivals in all phases of the life of the people, domestic and public, not only of religious beliefs and ceremonies, such as those connected with birth, marriage, and death, but in agriculture and industry, games and dances, and even medical lore. The living Greek has inherited not only the lands, language, and, in part, the blood and character of the old Greeks, but also much of their religion. As Edmond About once said in his *La Grèce contemporaine* (1854), "Of all the ruins of Greece the Greek people are not the least interesting."

Before discussing some of the more important features of the ancient popular religion, we shall give by way of introduction some account of the general characteristics of religion as professed by the ordinary cultivated Greek of the classical period, the picture largely reflected in literature and art, and so in many ways on a higher level than that of the common folk, and the picture commonly presented by historians of the subject.

Greek religion had a long history, continuing for centuries on the

plane of anthropomorphic polytheism behind which were other unrecorded centuries of a cruder animism. During its history it was quite free of tradition, revelation, and dogma, continually borrowing and assimilating new and even foreign forms. From the sixth century B.C. onward it was continually moulded by the imagination of poets, artists, and thinkers, even as Christianity has been, and was always an integral part of expanding Greek civilization, showing the same freedom and progressiveness so characteristic of other phases of that culture. Long after the political independence of Greece had ended, and the Greeks had become a small fragment in the world-state of Alexander and later in that of Rome, the old religion lived on and influenced Christianity by which it was superseded, an influence which is still alive.

Greek religion lacked many of the features which have been fundamental in other religions of the ancient and modern world. It had no sacred writings, no creeds, and no dogmas—things which have impeded the progress of Christianity. At best it was a religion of practice rather than of belief. While shrine rituals were meticulously carried out by local priests, there was no restriction on the religious imagination. It had no founder, human or divine, no revealer, and no reformer, though certain teachers, such as the mythical Orpheus, advocated certain beliefs. Greece, in its whole history, produced only one great religious mind, Plato, and he was a philosopher rather than a prophet or reformer, and his influence was neither immediate nor exerted on the common mind, but came to fruition only in late antiquity when his doctrines, modified, reappeared in the eclectic system of Plotinus, Neoplatonism, the last religious philosophy of the Greeks, which Windelband has called "the mummification of Hellenism," since it embalmed in it various ideas from earlier philosophical systems and religious cults, which had little influence on the ordinary man.

As Christianity is in our time, Greek religion was subordinate to the state, which appointed the priests, established, maintained, and supervised the altars and temples, and administered religious law in the state courts. The priests never formed a powerful caste able to thwart religious curiosity. They served no parish and did no preaching, their activity being limited to carrying out the time-honored ritual at local shrines. Thus Greek religion could not retard secular advance, as the Christian church did in the Middle Ages, but, on the contrary, speculation and progress were regarded as divine attributes. There was felt no need of intermediaries between man and the godhead like the Christian saints. The particularism of the city-state was reflected in it, for each city had its own group of gods and type of worship. There was no national

religion, because there was no national state down to the time of Philip and Alexander. There was a variety of cults, of which only a few, *e.g.*, that of Delphi, were Panhellenic in scope. In short, everything in Greece—the physical contour of the country broken up into small valleys by mountain chains and indentations of the sea, differences in blood, dialects, traditions, and customs—made for variety rather than uniformity in individuals and city-states, and nowhere was this more prominent than in religion. Consequently that religion was ever complex and never harmonized, even though it, like Greek literature and art, tended toward a common physiognomy.

The absence of a founder, revelation, theology, sacerdotalism, and uniformity made the religion of Greece singularly pliable and free. A Greek was not supposed to neglect the externals of the public worship, nor to teach open disbelief in the gods or introduce new ones, nor to destroy sacred property. But otherwise he was free to think and talk as he pleased without fear. Aristophanes ridiculed the gods through the medium of the comic stage, and Euripides despised most of them in his tragedies. But no one down to the fourth century B.C. could openly proclaim himself an atheist nor deride public worship. The list of religious suspects, extending from Aspasia to Aristotle, was a short one, and, despite trials for impiety, Greece had only one real martyr, Socrates. Such trials were far more political than religious. The killing of Socrates at the hands of the city of which he was the chief glory cannot be laid so much to his religious teaching or acts—Xenophon says he was punctilious in observing all the ritual demands of the state cult even to the day of his death—as to his political views expressed after the ousting of the Thirty Tyrants, when anything smacking of aristocratic or oligarchic government was distasteful to democratic Athens. Moreover, in his case the immediate circumstances of the trial were the real factors in his condemnation.

No religion, ancient or modern, has shown a greater separation of religion and ethics, for these in Greece remained distinct till late antiquity, a condition difficult for us to conceive, since they have been indissoluble in Christianity from the first. Christian preachers have always been more concerned with human conduct than with Kant's essentials of religion—God, immortality, and freedom of the will. The ethical example of the gods was little appealed to before Plato's time. The gods were regarded merely as superhuman men, swayed by similar passions—deceit, anger, vindictiveness, cruelty—as well as by kindliness and helpfulness. They followed the ethical standard of man throughout antiquity until the declaration of the Golden Rule: "Outdo your friends

in acts of kindness, your enemies in those of evil." It was Jesus who was fortunate enough to change that ideal for Western civilization, even though enlightened minds had proclaimed the same message before—Confucius in China, Gautama in India, Socrates in Greece, and Hillel in Palestine. The immoralities attributed to the gods by countless myths were an inevitable drawback to ethical progress. Greek morality was, therefore, a social rather than a religious phenomenon. Only the loftier minds could see in the imperfect gods guardians of law and conduct. The Orphics, who arose in the sixth century B.C., were the first to inculcate morality as a prerequisite to future happiness, even though the means which they employed to that end were ritualistic, physical purifications and dietary regulations.

Despite its formalism this religion was able to influence deeply all phases of Greek life, both public and private. Every happening in the life of individuals or states was believed to depend for its success on the favor of some god, that favor received in return for prayer and sacrifice, a *quid pro quo* arrangement. The calendar was mainly a device for determining the dates of the festivals. Greek art, both literary and plastic, was influenced by religion. In fact, Greek art was the handmaid of religion, as it was again and for the last time during the Renaissance. The sculptor has preserved the forms of the divinities as they appeared to Greek imagination in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.; the vase painter has left us a picture of ritual acts; and temple ruins still attest the impressiveness of their holy places. Greek literature is saturated with religious sentiment; the drama was religious in origin and remained so throughout its history; philosophy was always theological in tone; and Greek law was regarded as the reflection of divine law, as we see in Socrates' beautiful discussion of it in Plato's *Crito*. Athletic games grew out of religious assemblies—*panegyreis*—which at first were associated with heroes and later with gods. Poets, artists, and philosophers found beauty and truth in religion. It has often been said that never have the human character of the godhead and the divine nature of man been better appreciated than in Greece. While the Hebrews imagined that man was created in Yahweh's image, the Greeks made their gods in their own image.

Two striking characteristics of this religion should be stressed, its beauty and joyousness. There was the pomp of worship—the beautiful temples and statues still the ideal and despair of architects and sculptors, the stately and colorful processions, the gay festivals and solemn rituals. In their gods the Greeks saw their earthly aspirations and ideals reflected as well as their own faults and shortcomings. There is nothing more

beautiful in the whole range of worship than the great Panathenaic procession with which Athena, the Madonna of Athens, was honored. It yet lives on the frieze of the Parthenon, her greatest shrine, still lovely in its sunset glory. Here is shown a galaxy of beautiful forms moving along from the lower city to the Acropolis crowned with the immortal monuments of that mortal race in the luminous atmosphere of the city of "the violet crown."

Greek religion was not only beautiful, but joyous as well, without the sombre features so wrongly emphasized by Christian preachers. It rested lightly on men, for its most outstanding feature, as Jane Harrison pointed out long ago, was its comparative freedom from fear, which Christianity with its hereafter of bliss and punishment can never attain. The Greek did not follow the unattainable standard of the Hebrew nor was he oppressed by a deep sense of sin. He did not despise himself nor think too highly of his gods, and he knew that the wicked prospered quite as often as the good. The festivals were seasons of gaiety and joy accompanied by music and dancing, and were holidays as well as holy days, and Athens had more of them than we have Sundays. There was, of course, a darker side, but fortunately it was not emphasized by literature or art. Repulsive, cruel, and grotesque features—and these by no means exclusively of primitive savagery—existed side by side with nobler ones. But, on the whole, Hellenic worship was decent and refined if compared with that of the Oriental cults, even that of Aphrodite being mostly decorous. Ugliness existed, but was never prominent.

After this inadequate survey of certain characteristics of the religion professed by cultivated Greeks in the centuries of their greatness, we turn to our main theme, the popular religion, to discuss some few of its more prominent features, and especially those which have survived to our time. The subject of ancient religious survivals as found in the folklore and folk songs of modern Greece is immense and has produced a long line of English, German, French, and Greek investigators: Abbott, Fauriel, Frazer, Garnett, Hahn, Lawson, Legrand, Passow, Polites, Rodd, Schmidt, and many others. Here we can only present a few examples some of which the writer has taken from his earlier work, *Greek Religion and its Survivals.*[2]

One of the oldest and most beautiful aspects of the popular religion was the belief that spiritual powers haunted various parts of nature—ocean and sea, mountains and caves, rivers and fountains, groves and individual trees, etc. In this way the different aspects of the weather-

[2] Boston, 1923; a volume in the series, "Our Debt to Greece and Rome," edited by G. D. Hadzsits and D. M. Robinson.

god Zeus arose. Hermes, long before he was raised to Olympus in the Homeric picture, was merely a spirit dwelling in a mound or cairn (*herma*), first in Arcadia, and so became the protector of wayfarers and shepherds everywhere. Apollo's title *Lykeios* shows that he was once a wolf-god rather than one of light. As averter of evil he was originally connected with sacred stones set up before gateways, such as those found by Dörpfeld and Blegen in front of the gates of Homeric Troy, or the *omphalos* at Delphi, which at first was such a stone, though later regarded as the navel of the world. In 1936 Hrozný published an inscription on a Hittite altar which contained the name Apulunas, evidently the Oriental form of Apollo and thus proving his Eastern origin, often asserted and as often denied. For there Apulunas was protector of gateways as Apollo was in Greece. Another of his titles was *agyieus,* "of the street," and a conical pillar, representing his spirit, was usually placed at the street doors of Greek houses. Pan, the goat-legged offspring of Hermes, dwelling in the mountains and glens of Arcadia, also became the protector of shepherds and their flocks, and his worship spread everywhere, reaching Athens during the Persian wars. Every river had its spirit represented in the form of a bull or a bull with a human head. The Centaurs, half horse and half man, were similar water spirits, if Kretschmer's etymology, "water whippers," is right. The Sileni, at first a single spirit of springs and rivers in his native Lydia, later became the half-drunken and rollicking companions of the youthful Dionysus like the Satyrs who originally were also dæmons of forest and spring.

More important and lasting were the female spirits of nature, the nymphs, who appeared in lovely form and for the most part benevolent and possessed of prophetic power. Unlike the male dæmons mentioned, who represented the rougher aspects of nature, the nymphs generally reflected its gentler ones. They were localized everywhere, as spirits of the ocean (the Oceanids), of the sea (the Nereids, such as Achilles' mother Thetis), of fresh water and fountains (the Naiads), of rivers (the Potameids), of trees (the Dryads), etc. They were especially favored by women who looked to them for aid in travail. Artemis was originally a nymph and their leader, but later became the virgin sister of Apollo and "the huntress chaste and fair," the "Lady of the Wilds," like her far-away prototype, the great goddess of Minoan Crete, and finally the most popular of all Greek goddesses.

The Greek peasant of today still reveres the nymphs whom, however, he has condensed under the generic name Neraids, the modern name applied in antiquity to the sea nymphs only, while today the word "nymph" means what it did in the *Iliad,* a "bride." The Neraids

resemble the nymphs of old, for they haunt the same places and similar tales are told of them in folklore. Their leader is now "the fair lady" or "queen of the mountains," as she is called on the island of Zante, a last reminiscence of Artemis. No peasant will cut down a tree supposed to be the home of one, for if he does he is "smitten dumb." In antiquity the nymphs sometimes inspired fear, being called "the dread goddesses" of the country folk in Theocritus' seventh *Idyl.* Nowadays, because of their more malevolent character, they are euphemistically called "the beautiful ladies," since the old custom still prevails of complimenting harmful powers. The Neraids, like their ancient prototypes, still hunt, sing, and dance, and may even marry mortals, though soon, like Thetis of old, they grow weary of human companionship and flee away. In the Homeric *Hymn to Aphrodite* they are described as "of the clan neither of mortal nor of immortal gods," for they eat heavenly food and dance with the gods, but must die. Today, while long-lived, they are also deathly. The fact that the Nereids alone of all the nymphs have survived shows their importance in the popular imagination and forms one of the best examples of the persistency of such beliefs.

The belief still persists also that the Neraids as well as other nature dæmons are wont to appear at certain hours, at midnight as with Hecate, or more commonly at noontide, the latter the hour when men enjoy their siesta indoors. In late antiquity it was believed to be the hour when the gods visited their temples, Porphyry of the third century stating that the curtains in Greek temples were then drawn and a sign placed over the entrance warning men not to enter. Apollonius Rhodius has Jason see the Libyan nymphs at Lake Tritonis at noon, and Callimachus says the youthful Teiresias was then surprised and blinded by Athena as he beheld her bathing in Hippocrene. Ovid has the huntsman Actæon meet his doom because he saw Artemis and her nymphs at their noonday bath. L. Schmidt, in his *Griechische Maerchen* (1877), has shown how this superstition influenced the translators of the Septuagint in rendering the words of Psalm 91 : 6, which appear in our version as "the destruction that wasteth at noonday," "destruction and noontide dæmon," *i.e.,* Pan. According to the first *Idyl* of Theocritus, Pan during the heat of noonday slumbered, and peasants feared to disturb his rest. Still today the peasants think it dangerous to stay around a fountain or to be under the shade of certain trees at noon. In Crete one should not then stand in a doorway, in Arachova the flute must not be played, and on Hymettus the Neraids still dance. Whoever disturbs the repose or the sport of a dæmon receives the "sudden" punishment, which recalls the "sudden hour" of Plato.

Another spirit of the popular religion was the house guardian which has also survived. Zeus *Herkeios,* "of the fence," *i.e.,* the fence surrounding the house with his altar in the courtyard within, was widely revered. The twin sons of Zeus, the Dioscuri, were house gods in Sparta, where their festival, the *Dioscureia,* was celebrated, when a meal and couch were set up, and at Athens a table set with a simple meal stood in the Prytaneum or town hall. There was also the ubiquitous Good Dæmon—*Agathos Daimon*—who in the form of a snake protected the house, and to whom after a meal a libation of wine was poured on the floor. At first sight it seems curious that the sky-god Zeus should appear as a snake, which usually represents souls of the dead, and this has caused scholars to regard the sky-god also as a chthonian one and to derive all domestic cults from the cult of the dead. But the Minoan house goddess was also a snake-goddess, not because she was queen of the lower world, as Sir Arthur Evans had maintained, but, in the opinion of Nilsson, because she was originally a house goddess. The snake, the original house guardian, became anthropomorphized and yet survived as her attribute. Similarly Athena was the house goddess of the Mycenæan king at Athens and inherited the Minoan snake as her attribute. In this way Zeus could appear as a house protector in snake form. The snake has survived not only in modern Greek folklore, but is world-wide. In Greece the house spirit receives a share of St. Basil's cake on New Year's eve in most households. He is believed to disappear if the house is destroyed, even as a Neraid does when the tree in which she dwells is cut down.

Sometimes the house genius is now propitiated by a curious ceremony which leads us back to human sacrifice for its origin—though the victim now is replaced by his shadow. The uneducated today, as in antiquity, regard a man's shadow as the vital part of him, its loss meaning death. Theophrastus and, nearly five centuries later, Pausanias both recount the belief that whoever entered the precincts of Zeus on Mt. Lycæus in Arcadia lost his shadow and died within the year. Schmidt found a curious remembrance of this belief on the island of Zante. Here, to insure the stability of the house, or more commonly elsewhere of a bridge, the life of a man or animal was required, its blood being allowed to drip down upon the foundation stone. In lieu of a man the builder could substitute his shadow and bury the measure of it below the stone, and again the man would die within the year. Schmidt was informed that fear of the law alone kept builders from performing such a rite.

Aristotle, in his *Ethics,* tells us that anciently assemblies and sacrifices took place after the harvest when people had leisure. Maximus of

Tyre, of the end of the second century, in his *Dissertations,* more explicitly records that the peasantry began festivals and initiations, choruses of dancers in Dionysus' honor at the winepress, and initiation in honor of Demeter on the threshing floor. And it is clear that most Greek festivals had an agrarian origin, thus reflecting the importance of agriculture and viticulture in early Greece. Many of these were in honor of the great peasant deities: Demeter, the "grain mother," and her daughter Kore, the "grain maiden," as goddesses of cultivated cereals—barley, wheat, and oats—which in antiquity as now formed the chief food of the common man, and Dionysus, god of viticulture and wine. To Demeter were devoted the *Thesmophoria* and originally the *Eleusinia,* both celebrated at the autumnal sowing, the former a women's fertility festival, since women were considered to be best fitted for fertility magic; the festival of *Demeter the Verdant* (Chloe), because of the young grain, celebrated in the winter when Attic crops were thriving; and the *Thalysia*—the only festival mentioned by Homer—a private one celebrated on every farm at the June threshing like our harvest home and described poetically by Theocritus in his seventh *Idyl,* at the close of which he mentions Demeter's altar on the threshing floor.

At the latter an offering of first fruits, the *thalysios, i.e.,* a loaf of new wheat, was made. Such an offering in Attica was called *thargelos* from which another festival, the *Thargelia,* was named, celebrated in honor of Apollo and Artemis with purificatory rites just before the harvest in late May or early June. The custom of first fruits was widespread in Greece as elsewhere in the ancient world, and in origin reaches back to prehistoric times, being older than any of the god cults, its beginnings enmeshed in fertility magic. Besides the loaf at the *Thalysia* and *Thargelia* there were other offerings of cooked fruits which were carried about, the mixture and the loaf being two forms of the same custom. Similar offerings were made at Apollo's festival of the *Pyanepsia,* celebrated in late October or early November and named from the dish of beans then carried around and eaten, a feature of a fruit harvest as the *thalysia* were of a cereal harvest, though both types were called *panspermia* and *pankarpia* interchangeably.

In this connection we should mention one of the oldest cult vessels known, the *kernos*—used from remote antiquity to the present day. Though varying in shape such vessels all had a central lamp and around the sides small cups as receptacles for cereals and fruit, oil and wine. It has been found in Minoan Crete and in Mycenæan Eleusis, and as recently as 1938 five different deposits of them, dating from the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., have been unearthed in the Athenian Agora

near where a temple or *Eleusinion* stood. It is used by the Eastern Church on various occasions. Mixed seeds are still offered to the dead in churchyards at the modern Greek equivalent of All Souls' Day before Lent or Whitsunday, as they were on the third day of the ancient *Anthesteria,* in honor of Dionysus, and also during the harvesting and gathering of the fruit. Such offerings are no longer called *panspermia,* but *kollyba, i.e.,* small fruit cakes, round like a coin (*kollybos*), a name first found in the *Plutus* of Aristophanes, then eight hundred years later in Hesychius' *Lexicon,* and still later in the Middle Ages. Thus the *kernos,* as well as the offering contained in it, is one of the most remarkable examples of persistency in cult usage. Starting in the prehistoric strata of the popular religion it has lasted to our time.

Dionysus had four great festivals in consecutive months, all of country origin: the *Little* or *Rustic Dionysia,* celebrated in December after the vintage was over, a festival described by Aristophanes and Plutarch with a procession of *phallus* carriers whose jokes gave rise to comedy; the *Lenæa* in January at the shrine of Dionysus in the Marshes, a suburb of Athens, where the wine was ceremoniously drunk; the *Anthesteria* or "Festival of Flowers," a three-day celebration in February (on the first day the *Pithoigia,* named from the opening of the wine casks, and corresponding to the Roman *Vinalia,* the casks being brought to Dionysus' shrine and blessed, on the second the Festival of Jugs [*Choes*], when each worshipper took his share in small jugs, and on the third an offering of vegetables and water to the dead); and lastly the *City Dionysia* in March, which Pisistratus brought to Athens from Eleutheræ near the Bœotian border, at which tragedy originated and the great tragedians presented their plays throughout the historical period. Another vintage festival, held in October, and part of a festival in honor of Athena Skiras, was called *Oschophoria* from the vine branches heavy with grapes which were carried by youths dressed as women from Dionysus' shrine to that of Athena, followed by a race where the prize was a concoction of five different ingredients.

A less important festival should not be forgotten, the one held on Rhodes at the commencement of spring when boys carried around from house to house a swallow, sang, and asked for gifts of food. Today in Macedonia and Peloponnesus on March 31 boys still carry a painted and beflowered wooden image of a swallow on the end of a pole, sing, and demand gifts, one version of the song heard in Thessaly being very similar to the ancient Rhodian swallow-song preserved by Athenæus.

Of all ancient Greek festivals the one celebrated in October at the hamlet of Eleusis near Athens was among the oldest and finally reached

the loftiest manifestation of popular religion. Archæology has found a Mycenæan *megaron* beneath the ruins of the Hall of Mysteries, as well as Mycenæan examples of the *kernos.* It was originally a prehistoric family agrarian cult, a fact overshadowed in scholarly interest by the attempt to discover its Mysteries. Of these, apart from the non-secret preliminary formula recited by the neophyte and in part given by Clement of Alexandria and found on various gold leaves recently discovered in Crete, Athens, South Italy, and elsewhere, we know precisely nothing beyond the fact that certain things, quite unknown, were said, done, and shown by the *hierophant,* the initiating "shower of sacred rites," as the name indicates, especially at the culminating third and highest degree of the Mysteries, the *epopteia,* mentioned by Plutarch and others. But we do know something of the religious ideas involved—the two pairs of deities, each supplemented by a hero: the "mother" (Demeter), "maid" (Kore), and Triptolemus; and the "god" (Pluto), goddess (Persephone), and Eubouleus; and a seventh, Iacchus (merely the personification of the Bacchic cry uttered during the procession along the Sacred Way from Athens) identified with Dionysus.

The basis of the Eleusinian cult is found in the most beautiful of the *Homeric Hymns,* that to Demeter, "an example of Greek religious faith in its most pervasive and romantic aspects," as Andrew Lang has characterized it, a composition of the close of the seventh century B.C., rediscovered in Moscow in 1780. Herein is recounted the story of the rape of Kore by Pluto, to whom Zeus had given her, and the subsequent mournful search for her daughter by Demeter. Because of the latter's steadfast refusal to return to Olympus, Kore, at the command of Zeus, was finally allowed to return to earth for two-thirds of the year, but because she had eaten pomegranate seeds, the food of the dead, she must remain with Pluto in the nether world the other four months—these seasons reflecting the division of the years into three parts as found in Homer, Hesiod, and Æschylus, which, according to Diodorus, went back to an Egyptian source. All scholars have connected this story rightly with vegetation, but curiously have misinterpreted its meaning by having Kore remain below during the winter months and return to the world above during those of spring and summer, a view defended as late as 1934 by Kourouniotes who, like others, neglected the fact that Demeter was "the giver of good crops," as the *Hymn* says, *i.e.,* of cultivated cereals, rather than goddess of all vegetation.

It was left for Dr. Nilsson to show that the allotment of time was inconsistent with the climatic conditions in Attica where Eleusis lay. Here, contrary to northern climes where the soil is frozen in winter and

crops flourish only in summer, the grain is sown in October, sprouts and grows during the winter, except during January, ripens and is reaped in May, and threshed and stored in underground silos in June. It was then that Kore remained below four months, *i.e.,* in the silos, till these were opened in October, when the seed was sown again. That was the time of Kore's "ascent"—*anodos*—to the upper world to be reunited with her mother, and also the season when the Mysteries were celebrated.

In this way Dr. Nilsson explains how Pluto, whose name manifestly is derived from *ploutos,* "wealth," since grain is men's wealth, became god of the underworld. The story of the abduction is Minoan as is the name of Persephone who became identified with Pluto's consort. The "grain maiden" appeared at Eleusis both as Demeter's daughter Kore and as Pluto's wife Persephone, two ancient deities fused into one, the pre-Greek "queen over death and the dead," and the Greek "grain maiden."[3] Thus, the reunion of mother and daughter is at the base of the celebration, in joyous contrast with the mournful season of search just before. Whether the reunion was enacted or merely symbolically indicated we cannot say, though the third-century Christian writer Hippolytus says "an ear of reaped corn" (*i.e.,* "a spike of wheat") was displayed in silence, "the great, wonderful, most perfect, and highest visible mystery." This seems probable enough even if Church writers on Greek mysteries are generally untrustworthy.

Ideas of justice, peace, and brotherhood were added to the original agrarian cult and brought about a change in morality as we see in Hesiod's poem. While there is no evidence of the early teaching of immortality at Eleusis—though the idea has been made popular by modern research on the basis of late antiquity—since Greek ideas of immortality were hardly individual in early days, the agrarian rites in course of time did yield to its teaching. Thus, in the *Hymn to Demeter* we read: "Happy is he among deathly men who hath beheld these things; and he that is uninitiate and hath no lot in them hath never equal lot in death beneath the murky gloom."[4] This idea was later emphasized by Pindar, Sophocles, and even Aristophanes. There were no doctrines in the original rites, only the basic notion that life and death were symbolized by the new crop succeeding to the old. It was mainly because of this lack of dogma and because the Mysteries were connected with the deepest longings of the soul that they persisted through the centuries till at last the site was destroyed by Alaric during his invasion of Greece in 395-396.

[3] We here replace the English and continental use of "corn" by grain, specifically wheat, since "corn," like *frumentum* in Latin, is used for grain in general.

[4] Translated by Andrew Lang, *The Homeric Hymns,* New York, 1899.

Urban centres, especially Athens, took over the country festivals, modified them, and enhanced the pomp of their celebration. The old rites and general atmosphere have left their impress on the festivals especially of the Eastern Church, which show indubitable reminiscences of the ancient celebrations. The Greek Church festivals are celebrated on saints' days and usually at saints' chapels, where sometimes local minstrels, like the rhapsodists of Homer, improvise songs to regale the crowds that assemble not only for religious but, as in antiquity, for social and even commercial purposes. Some, like Olympia of old, have become Panhellenic, while others are of local interest only, and may be celebrated on ancient holy spots, *e.g.*, that of the Panaghia (Virgin) on Ithome, a site once sacred to Zeus. We shall mention briefly only two of the greater festivals, one Roman, the other Greek in origin, which recall ancient features.

The chief festival of today is the twelve-day holiday extending from Christmas to Epiphany, which in origin goes back to several Roman celebrations around the turn of the year, notably the *Saturnalia,* the great festival of the winter solstice which commemorated the golden age of Saturn who introduced agriculture into Italy as Demeter did in Greece. This was a season, beginning December 17 and continuing for several days, of equality between free and slave, of desistance from war and violence, when schools were closed and malefactors could be neither tried nor punished, and when gifts were exchanged, in general a period of unrestrained merriment. It had no connection with the Greek *Cronia* in honor of Cronus, the harvest-god identified by the Romans with Saturn, a festival celebrated at the commencement of the Attic year at the close of July or beginning of August, but was borrowed by the Greeks from Rome during the Empire. Various features of the old festival reappear in our merry Christmastide.

The national festival of "Our Lady of Annunciation" (St. Evangelistria) occurs on March 25—a lesser one also on August 15—in the pilgrim church on the island of Tinos (Tenos), when crowds of pilgrims, four or five thousand strong, from all over the Greek world assemble, as the Ionians did in the time of Homer on the neighboring isle of Delos in honor of Apollo. They come to be healed of diseases to this Mecca, which is only a century old, as traditionally the church was founded on the day Greek independence from Turkey was declared on the spot where an icon of the Virgin, believed to have been painted by St. Luke, was found. The festival shows ancient survivals especially in the fasting and prayer, and in passing the night in or near the church so as to be near the holy icon, for these were features of the ancient cult of Asclepius,

especially temple-sleeping or incubation. Many of our present-day Greeks, like their ancestors, believe that diseases are caused by malevolent dæmons which can be exorcised by the priest through the favor of a saint, each of the latter having appropriated to himself a particular sphere of disease. Even the kissing of icons, practiced here and elsewhere, recalls the ancient habit of kissing statues in the belief that they possessed curative powers. Cicero speaks of a bronze Heracles at Agrigentum in Sicily whose chin and mouth had been kissed away in hope of relief, even as the toe of the statue of St. Peter in the latter's basilica in Rome has been kissed away. During church festivals icons are adorned with laurel and myrtle just as statues of the gods were garlanded in antiquity, and the carrying of an icon in procession recalls the occasional carrying of the statue of Dionysus in antiquity from the city shrine of the god.

An interesting popular cult was that of Hestia, the spirit of the hearth, a Greek rather than a Mycenæan creation, since the Minoans had portable fire pots instead of fixed fireplaces. The hearth, like the meal cooked on it, was sacred, its sanctity explained by animal sacrifice, the chief Greek religious rite. Robertson Smith explained this long ago as of totemic origin, the belief that the sacrificed animal was the god himself, and that eating its flesh united the worshipper with him. But in the absence of any evidence of totemism among the Greeks or any other Indo-European people, a better explanation is that the meal was common to both god and worshipper, each receiving his share of the sacrifice. Thus the sanctity of the hearth was inherent and not conferred by Hestia, who never became a fully anthropomorphized deity in Greece. In this connection Dr. Nilsson has remarked on two fundamental differences between the Greek and the Christian religions. In Christianity a place is made holy by building a church upon it, while in antiquity a place was not sanctified by erecting a temple upon it, but the temple was placed there because the spot was already holy. Whoever touched the hearth, therefore, was sacred also, and this explains why so many Greek fugitives became suppliants at hearths, *e.g.*, Themistocles at the hearth of Admetus, king of the Molossians in Epirus. Again, while the Greeks used sacred places both for religious and non-religious purposes, *e.g.*, the hearth for cooking and heat as well as for sacrifice, Christianity keeps things sacred and profane ever separate. As the family had its hearth, so the state had its perpetual fire in the council chamber where, consecrated as it was to Hestia, as in Athens, certain officials and guests of honor dined. When a colony was founded, a part of this common fire was transported to the new hearth, a symbol of the filial relation of the colony to its mother city.

Superstition in many forms honeycombed the beliefs of the Greek countryside as everywhere else. We find evidence of it even in Athens itself in the days of her greatness, though Attic writers say little about it. The borrowing of Hecate, the Carian goddess of witchcraft and enchantment, during the early archaic period is proof of superstition thus early. She is mentioned in the Homeric *Hymn to Demeter* as the handmaid to Persephone and is called omnipotent in Hesiod's *Thegony.* But she never became a great goddess either in Greece or Rome, but frequented the crossroads on moonlight midnights, accompanied by howling dogs and ghosts, and her triple image—because she looked three ways or because she was at times identified with the moon goddess, Artemis or Persephone—stood in front of Greek houses. Theocritus, in his first *Idyl,* tells of the incantations used in her rites.

There were many other uncanny spirits which haunted the countryside: Mormo, a hideous she-monster like the Roman Mania; Gello, a vampire goblin who carried off children; Empusa, who assumed various shapes—Aristophanes says those of a beast, a dog, a snake, or a fair maiden—sent forth by Hecate to frighten travelers whose blood she sucked; Onoscellis, a donkey-legged sprite, perhaps only another name for Empusa. One of the worst of all was the Lamia, at first a blood-sucking monster, but later a generic name for all such beings of the spirit world. But the original Lamia, according to Diodorus, had an honorable lineage, for she was a lovely Libyan queen beloved of Zeus, and so aroused the jealousy of Hera who robbed her of her children. She then hid herself in the caves and rocks of the seacoast and became an ugly and malevolent spirit stealing the children of others and sucking the blood of older people as well. By Aristophanes' time she was a butt of the comic stage and in later antiquity survived only in nursery tales and still later as a voluptuous woman who enticed youths, the vampire type described by Philostratus and reappearing in Keats' poem. While the educated did not believe in such spectres, they were used as bugbears of children. They have survived among the modern peasantry, where mothers still use them to frighten unruly children into obedience.

There were also tombs and shrines of heroes all over Greece, especially in cairns and groves. A hero was merely a dead man who, for some reason, could leave his tomb and walk about in corporeal form at night and harm the living. The idea lingered in the country parts, but in the cities such revenants were usually regarded as benevolent beings and their cult, like that of Catholic saints, was bound to the tomb, and their power to their relics, which could be removed, as the bones of Theseus were transferred from the island of Scyros to Athens

by Cimon. Plato alludes to them in the *Phædo,* and Phlegon of the second century, in his *Wonderful Events,* tells a story about one. Perhaps the best story is that about the hero of Temesa, a town of South Italy. He was believed to be the spirit of Polites, one of Odysseus' companions, who had been stoned to death for attacking a maiden and since had dwelt in his sanctuary, where each year he demanded the sacrifice of the most beautiful maiden of the town. Finally, the famous boxer Euthymus, victor at Olympia in 480 and 472 B.C., entered the temple, fell in love with the maiden, and drove the spirit into the sea. Pausanias, who tells the story, adds that he saw an old painting in Temesa in which the hero appeared as a black figure clothed in a wolfskin. Another story lies at the base of the plot of Plautus' play, the *Mostellaria,* which was taken from the Greek poet Philemon of the New Comedy. A guest was slain and buried in a house which became haunted, since the man's ghost walked about and frightened people.

Perhaps out of the hero cult of revenants grew the ghastly modern Greek belief in the vampire, which still is called by the Slavic name *vrykolakas,* though the Slavs appear to have gotten the superstition from the Byzantine Greeks. This spectre is an undissolved and reanimated corpse which prowls around at night preying on men. Both the Church and the law have vainly tried to root out this belief which is today found all over southeastern Europe. When one is said to be abroad, a priest reads from the Bible at his suspected tomb, and, if this is not enough, a stake may be driven through the heart of the corpse.

The werewolf superstition, lycanthropy, still prevalent in Greece and elsewhere in southeastern Europe, has its prototype in the ancient imagination. This spectre is not a revenant, a dead man returned to life, but a living man who has the power to transform himself into a wolf for a season. Plato, in the ninth book of the *Republic,* recounts an "ancient tale" of how he who tasted of the entrails of the human sacrifice in honor of Zeus Lycæus became a wolf. Over five centuries later Pausanias (viii, 2, 6) says "a man has always been turned into a wolf at the sacrifice of Lycæan Zeus," and adds that he could regain his human shape nine years later, if only he had abstained from eating human flesh while in the form of a wolf. Pliny, the naturalist, tells (*H.N.* 8, 82) how a certain man ate of the entrails of a boy victim there and was turned into a wolf for nine years, but later became an Olympic victor in the boxing match, and he gives his name as Demænetus of Parrhasia, a district of South Arcadia. The same story with the same name is repeated by St. Augustine in his *City of God* (xviii, 17), but unfortunately no such name of an Olympic victor occurs in any of our lists.

Herodotus goes further with the superstition for he says (iv, 105) that every man among the Neuri, a tribe in eastern Europe, was annually turned into a wolf for a few days, though he professes not to believe it. Petronius also tells an extended story of a werewolf.

In a tract entitled the *Sacred Disease, i.e.,* epilepsy, a work of the fifth century B.C. and doubtless by Hippocrates, the "Father of Medicine," the quacks who called the disease "sacred" and who resorted to spells to cover up their ignorance are called magicians and charlatans. It is a well-known phenomenon of religion, observable still in our time, that superstition flourishes when human resources fail. In Greece a recrudescence of magic and superstition followed the beginning of the decay of the old faith after the Sophists had attacked it. This is especially shown at the end of the fifth century B.C. In Homer Asclepius is called "the blameless physician" rather than a god, for there Apollo was the chief healing deity. But later Asclepius eclipsed him in the art. He had many sanctuaries in Greece, visited by crowds of "suppliants of the god," as Pausanias calls the patients who came to be cured, the most famous of which was situated eight miles from the town of Epidaurus on the Saronic Gulf. Here was the grove or *hieron* in which stood the temple of the god, one of the most beautiful in Greece with its chryselephantine cult-statue by Thrasymedes of Paros, in a complex of many buildings—temples of Artemis and Aphrodite, the beautiful circular *tholos* whose exquisite carving is only equalled by that of the Erechtheum at Athens, cloisters, gymnasium, palæstra, bath, hospital, priests' house, etc. In the ruins of the *abaton* or dormitory inscriptions have been found which record the method of consultation with the god through dreams as well as the manner of the cure. Strabo says that the place was full of such votive tablets in which the cures were recorded. On the recovered inscriptions some of these cures are described, which seem as incredible as those of Lourdes or Tinos in our day, where hysterical affections are cured by the influence of strong emotion.

Similar tablets of metal have been found in the Amphiaraum, the "dream temple" of the seer Amphiaraus near Oropos in Attica, where healing springs and an oracle, famed in interpreting dreams, existed. In the ruins, parts of the body cured—artificial faces, hands, breasts, etc.—have been found, the offerings of hopeful or grateful patients. Such offerings have survived in Greece, since wax or silver parts of the body are found in the chapels of saints, especially at the shrine of Mary on Tinos already described. Coins are still stuck on icons with wax, thus recalling Lucian's account of the statue of Pelichus

which was believed to cure fevers, for coins were glued to its thighs with wax.

Plato in the *Laws* proposes severe penalties on magicians and speaks of imprecations (*katadeseis*) of black magic and of wax dolls found in tombs, the latter especially used by witches and sorcerers in their spells. Such enchantments aimed at personal enemies were inscribed on lead tablets and placed in tombs. Many such *tabellæ defixionis,* as the Romans called them, mainly of the fourth century B.C., have been found in Attica, and some of them mention historically known people. Such ideas, originating in prehistoric animism, the basis of Greek religion, have not been ousted by Christianity. There are even examples in Greece today of the ancient pillar cult, which flourished in Crete during the Bronze Age. Thus, the chapel of St. John of the Column in Athens is built round an unfluted Corinthian column so tall that it projects through the roof, probably the remains of a Roman sanctuary on the spot. It is believed to cure diseases, especially fevers, as St. John is the patron saint of those who suffer from them.

The popular idea of the hereafter in antiquity was that of Hades, the dark and gloomy lower world filled with powerless shadows, as pictured especially in the eleventh book of the *Odyssey.* Here the dead kept the same physical aspect as at the time of their death, even the scars of combat; so Odysseus could recognize his former companions in the shades which pass before him on the meads of asphodel. This Greek idea of the afterlife was no exception to the usual type, which patterns it after the life on earth. Of all the fancies conjured up by man's fear of death and the future, none is more dreary and hopeless than Hades. In fact, Rohde has said it is wrong to speak of an afterlife in the Homeric picture at all, as the spirits live only a shadowy copy of life here, unconscious and without memory except when momentarily recalled after drinking of the blood of a black ram sacrificed at the entrance. Only a few below have a happier lot, those in the Elysian Fields, and only the initiates into the Eleusinan Mysteries on earth have a better hope.

It was the Orphics, who arose in the sixth century B.C., who first offered a protest against the Homeric conception that the body was the real man and the soul a shadow, for they taught that the soul was immortal, during life imprisoned in the body and always longing to return to heaven whence it had come. They, like other Greeks, taught that the soul might leave the body temporarily as in dreams, but believed it left once for all at death. In consequence of such teaching a new concept of the life hereafter began, coupled for the first time with

morality and righteous living, whereas in the Homeric account there were neither rewards for righteousness nor penalties for the wicked. The few sinners mentioned by Homer as suffering in Tartarus, *e.g.*, Tantalus and Sisyphus, were originally enemies of the gods and punished here, but were later transferred below as we see in the *Odyssey* and in the painting of Polygnotus at Delphi as described by Pausanius. So much of the Orphic teaching had become enmeshed in the older Homeric picture. Thus arose the idea of future punishment in accord with the Semitic *lex talionis,* which still governs civilized law as it did in the time of Hammurabi and later of Moses, and ever new penalties were added as retributive justice.

Thus, by the fifth century, Hades had become a veritable chamber of horrors, full of monstrous beasts such as the Empusa, as we see in the description of pains inflicted on the dead in the *Frogs* of Aristophanes. This was in no sense mythology, for a reality of belief lay behind the poet's words in the minds of his audience. That such a future was believed in is also shown by a fragment of Democritus (297), the nature philosopher who had no use for supernatural agency in his mechanical world, and in a curious passage in the opening scene of Plato's *Republic* (330). Democritus says: "Some men, who do not know that human nature is dissolved in death, are constantly distressed, with the consciousness of evil done in life, by anxieties and fears, and invent false legends concerning the life hereafter." And Plato has the aged Cephalus say: "When a man thinks himself to be near death, he has fears and cares which never entered into his mind before; the tales of a life below and the punishment which is executed there of deeds done here were a laughing matter to him once, but now he is haunted with the thought that they may be true. . . ."[5] Such statements show how popular views of the hereafter had changed in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. Nilsson notes that A. Dietrich back in 1893 tried to show that the Christian hell was a Greek creation, a position denied by Cumont in 1922, who argued it was Oriental. If we take the earliest Christian picture of it, the so-called *Apocalypse of Peter,* written probably in Jerusalem, 100–145 A.D., we find that the background of his picture of penalties is Hades and not Sheol and Gehenna.

Side by side with the Christian idea of the hereafter, paradise for the good and hell for the wicked, the modern peasant still retains some of the old Greek concept of Hades which was so ingrained in the Greek mind that it has resisted all Christian teaching. Paradise to him is a lovely grove with streams of water and shade of trees. In Tartarus

[5] Translated by B. Jowett, *Plato's Dialogues* (3rd ed.), New York, 1892, vol. V.

the wicked are tied to a fiery wheel, surely a reminiscence of the punishment of Ixion for approaching Hera. Hades or Pluto is now Charus, *i.e.*, the ancient ferryman Charon, who with his wife Charondissa lives far below in the common home of the dead. Even Lethe's waters at the entrance are still believed to bring forgetfulness. Caves and gorges in Greece are still believed to be entrances to this world below. A notable cave is one in the western side of the promontory of Tænarum—Cape Matapan—through which in antiquity Heracles was believed to have dragged Cerberus to the upper world, and even the many-headed dog reappears in folklore. Charus is still importuned, as Pluto was in antiquity, to allow certain of the dead to return, but remains equally obdurate. Still there is a belief that between Easter and Whitsunday or on the Saturday before the latter, from midnight to dawn the dead may revisit the earth, and even attempts to get out of Hades are related in folk songs. Curiously, the modern peasant senses no contradiction between the old and the Christian ideas of the hereafter.

Religion in Greece remained simple and primitive in the backward countryside, and the rustic festivals and rites were there kept up. But in the commercial and industrial centres it was sure to become involved in politics. Ever since the Persian wars the town dwellers had ascribed the victory and consequent prosperity to the favor of the gods, but the latter were too cold and faraway to bring consolation to individuals in trouble. Thus, men became conscious of themselves and turned to deities who could help them in adversity—to Asclepius, to the Samothracian mystery gods called the *Cabiri* described in the *Peace* of Aristophanes and venerated by sailors, to the Phrygian Sabazius, a form of Dionysus, and to many others. Of the cult of Sabazius we have a curious picture in Demosthenes' oration against Æschines. Here Demosthenes accused his opponent of reading the sacred books while his mother performed the initiatory rites, and says he wore a fawnskin at night and purified the initiates, but by day, crowned with fennel and poplar and with snakes in his hands, he led crowds through the streets and danced. Such orgiastic cults had become attractive by the fourth century B.C., after the doubts of the Sophists and the ridicule of the gods by Euripides and Aristophanes on the stage had begun to undermine the old religion, and even atheism for the first time could be openly avowed and statesmen could use religion for political ends. Trials of impiety became frequent, for the common man still believed that neglect of religion had menaced the state, and even Aristotle was threatened. Foretelling the future through divination became an important phase of the popular religion, with some account of which superstition we close this survey.

Divination, by which the will of the supernatural powers is supposed to be learned, is a world-wide practice yet, as common today in Atlantic City as in ancient Athens. In antiquity it was carried out either by natural means, the psychic condition of the diviner who was supposed to be inspired, *e.g.*, the Pythia at Delphi, or artificially by magic and augury—omens, dreams, oracles, and the like. The cries of birds or the direction of their flight, especially of the eagle of Zeus, "the surest sign among winged fowl," and the hawk of Apollo, and the appearance of the entrails of sacrificed animals, a superstition reaching Greece ultimately from Babylonia and Italy through the Etruscans, and there perfected by the Romans into a science, were considered efficacious agents from Homer onward. The liver was regarded all through antiquity down to Plutarch as the seat of the passions—anger, fear, love—and so answered to our expression "the heart," and "hepatoscopy" became general. Plato called it the mirror in which the power of thought was reflected. The casting of lots has been common from Homer to our time. Dreams have ever been believed by both ignorant and educated to reveal the will of the supernatural, and Homer personified *Oneiros* as the messenger of Zeus in the *Iliad*. Æschylus and Pindar allude to the idea that the mind is unfettered in sleep and can then see into the realm of spirit, and Aristotle regarded dreams as the source of things divine. In late antiquity Artemidorus, a learned interpreter of dreams living in the second century, wrote a work in four books entitled *Oneirocritica*, which is still extant and a valuable source for contemporary thought. His object was twofold, to prove that the future is revealed through dreams and to clear the science of interpretation of abuses then surrounding it. Temple-sleeping, as at Epidaurus and Oropos already discussed, was conducive to inviting dreams, and the earliest literary evidence of it as part of cult ritual is found in the *Plutus* of Aristophanes, the scene of which is laid in a temple of Asclepius probably in the Piræus. Asclepius was long the best-known god of healing, but in hellenistic times was eclipsed by Serapis, whom Bouché-Leclercq long ago called "a Greek body haunted by an Egyptian soul," and Isis.

All through antiquity the oracle was believed to be the best way to learn the future. At Dodona in Epirus, the most ancient Greek oracle, answers were given through the rustling of the leaves of aged oaks—a reminiscence of tree worship. In the historical period when the power of Dodona waned—though the temple was consulted by people in the neighborhood until its destruction by the Ætolians in 210 B.C.—Delphi took its place, the chief seat of Apollo's worship. The utterances of the Pythia, written down by the priests and given in hexameter verse to the

persons who had come to consult the oracle, were at best vague and ever cryptic, though in general it may be said that the Greek oracles stood for religious and ethical progress. Xenophon is an excellent example of an educated Greek who shared in the popular superstition of divination, and his *Anabasis* is replete with remarks about oracles, omens, seers, and the like. Such ways of finding out the future were not despised then as they largely are now. Only in hellenistic times did their potency begin to wane. Some of the questions asked were trivial enough, as we see on the inscribed leaden tablets found in the ruins of Dodona by Carapanos in 1878, *e.g.*, on one a certain Lysanias asks if the child about to be born to his wife is his.

Seers accompanied every army, and the general was subordinate to them as we see in the tragic example of Nicias during the Athenian retreat from Syracuse in the Peloponnesian War. Sacrifices were often repeated until a favorable answer could be received. Such seers sometimes intrigued for their own advantage. Thus, Thucydides says that the anger of the Athenians raged against not only the politicians, but the oracle mongers who had advised the ill-fated Sicilian Expedition, since the latter were believed to have been in Alcibiades' employ. Oracle mongers — *Chresmologoi* — circulated collections of oracles which they ascribed to some old prophet, such as Bacis, the Bœotian seer, and these greatly influenced public opinion. Such a collection was brought by the Cumæan Sibyl to Tarquin at Rome, and the Sibylline books, a farrago of prophetic nonsense, were consulted for centuries thereafter. In the *Birds* of Aristophanes, when Cloud-cuckoo-town was founded, among the charlatans there was an oracle monger who read his oracles from a book; in the *Knights* a battle was staged by means of oracle collections to win the favor of Demos.

Not all such seers were fakers, however, for some were men of repute, such as the *exegetes,* the official interpreter of sacred rites and customs at Athens, who corresponded to the *interpres religionum* at Rome, or, in the late fifth century, Lampon, who had helped form the Athenian colony of Thurii in Italy. It was men of this sort who defended the old religion against the Sophistic ridicule and instituted trials for impiety. Long before, Xenophanes and Heraclitus had criticized Greek religion, but it was the Sophists who were the chief attackers. Critias, the pupil of Socrates and one of the Thirty Tyrants established at Athens by the Spartans in 404 B.C., said some wise man had invented the gods to keep men from secret sin; Prodicus that men considered everything essential a god, calling wine Dionysus, bread Demeter, fire Hephæstus; and Protagoras was unwilling or unable to say whether

the gods existed or not "because of the obscurity of the subject and the brevity of human life," which statement at the beginning of his book, *On the Gods,* led to his impeachment and banishment in 411 B.C. Euripides, who represented the "Age of Enlightenment" on the stage, won few prizes, while the religiously conventional Sophocles, his contemporary, won many.

Various phases of ancient witchcraft and magic have survived in Greece. Old crones and their philtres are as much in demand as in the time of the lovelorn Simætha pictured in the first *Idyl* of Theocritus. Astrology is similarly rife. Lucky and unlucky days are accepted as in the time of Hesiod. Plato says some days were presided over by malevolent powers, on which neither assemblies nor courts should be held. Today Tuesdays are unlucky and in Thessaly and Macedonia Saturdays as well. May is unlucky for marriages and February is "the lame month," and if children are then born they are likely to be crippled. On certain days in March and August certain types of labor should not be performed, and the first three or five and the last three or five are called *Drymiais.* In August rusty nails are used against such spirits; this made Tylor believe that they were survivors of the Stone Age, when iron was hostile. Ringing in the ears still means that you are being talked about, as it did in Lucian's time; twitching of the eyelids has the same meaning now as in antiquity; and sneezing still means confirmation, for then a hostile spirit is expelled, as in Xenophon's day when it was regarded as a sign from Zeus.

Enough has been said of the rites and customs of ancient origin which still form a part of the popular religion. Such survivals show that Old Greece lives on in New Greece. Religion, as we said at the outset, depends everywhere on conditions of life changing as these change, and Greek religion is an excellent example of the process. The first important change took place when people began to forsake the countryside for town life. Later on, the rise of democracy in the urban centres made further changes necessary, since the members of the Assembly which ruled Athens had official oversight over religion. Then Greek religion was constantly the recipient of new ideas to meet the new social and political needs, a movement well under way in the fifth century. And the last great change started at the end of that century, the doubts nurtured by the Sophists and the Age of Enlightenment. The issue was for centuries in the balance, and was not finally settled till the advent of Christianity. Even then, old religious customs and modes of thought lingered in the countryside, and some of these have survived to our time.

IS ROMAN CATHOLICISM WINNING?

CONRAD HENRY MOEHLMAN

Colgate-Rochester Divinity School

Is Roman Catholicism winning the religious race in the United States? One might so conclude after reading a dozen or more contemporary worriers, who are quoting and requoting the statements made by two noted American Catholic scholars some fifteen years ago—statements which seem to have set off a general alarm:

> . . . . constitutions can be changed, and non-Catholic sects may decline to such a point that the political proscription of them may become feasible and expedient. What protection would they then have against a Catholic state? The latter could *logically* tolerate only such religious activities as were confined to the members of the dissenting groups. It could not permit them to carry on general propaganda nor accord their organization certain privileges that formerly had been extended to all religious corporations, for example, exemption from taxation.

Even a hurried glance at the preliminary reports of the 1936 census of religious bodies in the United States should convince anyone that something like a *Blitzkrieg* descended upon both Protestantism and Catholicism here during the last decade and that both have a battle royal on their hands to survive, to say nothing of ever remotely ruling the non-church going population in the United States. For Protestantism will be fortunate if stabilized at one-fifth of the population as Roman Catholicism is already at one-seventh when all babies are counted in. All Roman Catholics in the United States reported thirteen years and over constituted only some ten per cent of its population in 1936.

No wonder, then, that the two Catholic scholars thus humorously continued their discussion of the future of Roman Catholicism in the United States:

> While all this is very true in logic and in theory, the event of its practical realization in any state or country is so remote in time and in probability that no practical man will let it disturb his equanimity or affect his attitude toward those who differ from him in religious faith. It is true, indeed, that some zealots and bigots will continue to attack the church because they fear that some 5,000 years hence the United States may become overwhelmingly Catholic and may then restrict the freedom of non-Catholic denominations.

How have religions in general and Roman Catholicism in particular fared in the United States during the decade 1926-1936? The latest religious census lists 256 denominations in the United States in 1936, a net gain of 43 denominations since 1926. But 32,582 organizations

vanished, expenditures decreased over 298 millions of dollars, and the value of churches decreased over 425 millions. Thus the depression took a heavy toll over seven years. The total reported religious population in the United States for 1936, including Protestants, all varieties of Catholics, Jews, Mohammedans, Buddhists, cults, sects, and the United Holy Church of America, Incorporated, came to only 55,807,366, that is, 43.4 per cent of the population in 1936. Christians constituted less than forty per cent of the population of the United States; Judaism less than four per cent; the cults somewhat less than one per cent. About one in every 7,000 persons in the United States was affiliated with non Judæo-Christian groups. Christianity is a gradually decreasing minority group in our country. While the population of the United States was increasing over ten per cent between 1926 and 1936, the total religious increase came to only a little over two per cent.

Roman Catholicism is putting up a magnificent struggle to survive at present strength in the United States. In 1906, Roman Catholics constituted 16.5 per cent of the population of the United States, but in 1936 only 15.5 per cent; those reported thirteen years of age and over only 9.5 per cent. Between 1916 and 1926, the increase in Roman Catholic adherents amounted to 18.3 per cent, whereas between 1926 and 1936 that increase came to but 7.03 per cent, in spite of the fact that the population of the United States increased 10.2 per cent. Add in all the non-Roman Catholic varieties of Catholics in the United States, and the relationships to total population is only 15.86 per cent. Roman Catholicism added 4,903 churches between 1906 and 1916; 1,565 churches between 1916 and 1926; but lost 531 churches between 1926 and 1936. Between 1916 and 1926, Roman Catholicism in the United States increased its expenditures over 132 millions of dollars but between 1926 and 1936, expenditures decreased over 65 millions of dollars. Between 1916 and 1926, the value of the Roman Catholic edifices here increased 463 millions of dollars but during the next decade decreased 50 millions of dollars.

The population of the United States between five and seventeen years of age in 1936 amounted to 31,618,000, but the religious census reports only 2,095,254 pupils in Roman Catholic parochial schools in that year. Since many non-Catholic children attend Roman Catholic parochial schools, one wonders whether some 57 per cent of Roman Catholic children may not be attending public schools. In the American Roman Catholic church there are at least 4,650,061 children under thirteen years of age (with 2,948,105 whose age is not reported). Does not this signify that at least two and one-half million Roman Catholic children under

thirteen years of age are not attending parochial schools? The Catholic struggle against secularization is witnessed to by a reported 972,891 pupils in Sunday school, 233,993 pupils in summer vacation Bible schools, and 589,729 pupils in weekday religious schools. I had not dreamed that the fight for Roman Catholic religious education had become so intense and so costly in the United States.

Surveying the country by sections, Roman Catholicism is seen to be increasing slightly in the New England states, the South Atlantic states, the Mountain and Pacific states while decreasing slightly in the remaining five sections of the United States. As far as the separate states are concerned, Roman Catholicism in 1936 constituted 50.3 per cent of the population of Rhode Island but only 29 hundredths of one per cent of the population of North Carolina. The median state was South Dakota with a Roman Catholic population of 12.8 per cent. In 39 states the Roman Catholic population came to less than 25 per cent; in 27 states to less than 15 per cent; in 20 states to less than 10 per cent; in 12 states to less than 4 per cent; in 9 states to less than 2 per cent. In Virginia and West Virginia, Roman Catholic population was stabilized with reference to total population at 1.5 and 4.1 per cent respectively.

After a cursory examination of the preliminary reports of the census of religious bodies in the United States, 1936, one must conclude that the day of easy and rapid growth for the older churches seems gone, and Roman Catholicism may not be able to report a complete conquest of the United States within the 5,000 years assumed by the noted authors of *The State and the Church.* In fact, at the present rate of retardation, Roman Catholics will have disappeared in the United States by 2401 A.D.!

LIGHT FROM THE GREEK TEXT ON THE DATE OF GALATIANS

H. E. DANA

Kansas City Baptist Theological Seminary

THERE is no problem in the entire field of New Testament introduction relative to which there has been greater variety of opinion than the date of the writing of Paul's epistle to the Galatians. The composition of this epistle has been assigned to dates anywhere from the Jerusalem conference to the end of Paul's "third missionary journey." These two occasions in Paul's ministry have usually been regarded as necessary *termini,* but in recent years there has been a steady increase of scholarly opinion in favor of a date prior to the Jerusalem conference. This position has been defended by Lake in his *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul* (revised in his *Introduction to the New Testament*), Duncan in his Commentary on Galatians in the Moffatt series, Emmet in his *Commentary on Galatians,* Grieve in Peake's *Commentary on the Bible,* Knox in Gore's *New Commentary on the Holy Scriptures,* Blunt in the *Clarendon Bible* on Galatians, and many others.

The purpose of this article is to call attention to some subtle phenomena in the Greek text of the New Testament which tend to support the contention for an early date. It is not claimed for these evidences that they are either fixed or final, but they do have a corroborative force when combined with other arguments which have been offered. Syntactical and lexical significance is altogether too flexible to constitute independent proof for any position, but not infrequently can be shown to be in harmony with a given conclusion. The reflections from the Greek text here presented are in striking harmony with the conclusion that Galatians was written at a very early date.

The one which first meets the student of the epistle appears in Gal. 1:6, "I marvel that you are so quickly (ταχέως) turning away from the one who called you." If its normal force is given to ταχέως, this statement would signify that the defection of the Galatian disciples had occurred only a very short while after Paul had evangelized them. It is true that the adverb does not invariably have this meaning. Three times in the New Testament (John 11:31; II Thes. 2:2; I Tim. 5:22) it denotes that which is done hastily or precipitately. But usually it signifies action on an immediately subsequent occasion, as in Luke 14:21, "Go out *quickly* into the streets and lanes," where it clearly means

promptly or *immediately;* or in Luke 16:6, "Take your account and sit down and *quickly* write fifty," where again the obvious significance is *immediately,* in consecutive order of time. The same force of the term is manifest in I Cor. 4:19; Phil. 2:19, 24; II Tim. 4:9. In the papyri we also find the same meaning generally apparent, as in *P. Oxy.* 1:116, "send him off *quickly*"; *P. Fay.* 126:7, "then return *quickly,* for it is urgent"; *P. Tebt.* 2:423, "tell me *immediately.*" Then we must conclude that the general meaning of ταχέως is *quickly,* in the sense of immediate succession in point of time. Accepting this definition in Gal. 1:6, we would naturally suppose that the Galatian disciples had turned against Paul very shortly after his return from his first visit to them, and that he had promptly been informed.

The particular juncture in his experience at which the letter was written is suggested in Gal. 2:1-10. In 2:1 he says "Then (ἔπειτα) after fourteen years I went up again to Jerusalem." Here special import attaches to the adverb ἔπειτα. Usually it means simply *afterwards* or *then.* In hellenistic Greek it is used frequently in enumerations of time to signify consecutive order of certain occasions, as in I Cor. 15:46, "Now the spiritual was not first (πρῶτον) but the natural; next (ἔπειτα) the spiritual"; or in *P. Oxy.* 9:1217, "greeting you first (πρῶτον); then (ἔπειτα) praying to the gods." Many examples appear which exhibit this meaning of consecutive order.

If ἔπειτα has this meaning in Gal. 2:1, Paul declares the visit here described to be his *second* visit to Jerusalem. The first was the visit to get acquainted with Peter, described in Gal. 1:18, 19, and the *next* visit was the one described in these verses. In accordance with Luke's account in Acts, this second visit was the journey from Antioch to Jerusalem to convey the charity provided by the church at Antioch for the destitute Judean disciples (Acts 11:27-30), often called the "eleemosynary visit."

We find in the Greek text a significant construction which tends to confirm this identification. In describing the hearty approbation which the Jerusalem apostles conferred upon his labors among the gentiles, Paul cites one restriction which they requested him to observe, "only that we should go on remembering (μνημονεύωμεν) the poor" (Gal. 2:10). The appearance of the present subjunctive here is interesting. It implies the continuance of that which was already in progress. Had Paul meant to say that the Jerusalem apostles requested him to assume the general practice of remembering the poor from time to time, he would normally have used the aorist, μνημονεύσωμεν, but no existing text has such an aorist here. In the next clause there does occur an aorist, which is highly

significant in comparison, the verb ἐσπούδασα. This clause may be rendered "which very thing I had already endeavored to do." We seem to find here reference to a specific act which had furnished the occasion for the request that had been made of Paul. Such an understanding of these verbs fits remarkably into the supposition that the visit described in this passage was the eleemosynary visit. The Jerusalem apostles urged that Paul "go on remembering the poor," in view of the fact that he "had already endeavored to do this very thing" in the offering he had brought from the church at Antioch.

It has been noted with amazement by students of Acts that Luke gives so little place to Paul's controversy with the Judaizers, and fails even to intimate the difficulty in the Galatian churches. But, assuming the South Galatian theory is correct, there may be in the Greek text such an intimation. It appears in the word ἐπιστηρίζοντες, which means to *restore to a stable or peaceful condition.* The import which Luke attaches to it may be seen in Acts 14:22, where he uses it relative to the work of Paul and Barnabas on their return journey through the churches they had recently established. These churches had suffered a terrific scourge of persecution, so it was necessary for Paul and Barnabas to restore order and stability. The same word is used again in Acts 15:41, where Paul passes through the churches of Syria and Cilicia at the beginning of his second missionary journey, and on into the Galatian churches (16:1ff.). If we apply the same significance which attaches to the word in Acts 14:22, we must suppose that again the churches had been disturbed by destructive forces of some kind. What were the disintegrating factors that had afflicted them this time? We have a very plausible answer if we suppose the difficulties reflected in the epistle to the Galatians to have recently transpired. And Paul would have had an effective instrument for the restoration of order in the decree of the Jerusalem council.

It is worthy of note that when Luke describes Paul's next visit to the Galatian churches in Acts 18:23, he uses the simple form of the Greek verb, στηρίζων. While some Western and Syrian witnesses read the compound form ἐπιστηρίζων here, such a reading must be regarded as a harmonistic corruption. Luke tells us that Paul went through the churches of Galatia this time simply to strengthen or confirm them. His work was edification rather than restoration. This harmonizes perfectly with the supposition that the settlement of the Judaizing controversy had been consummated in the previous visit, by the use of the Jerusalem decree.

Those who favor a later date for the Galatian letter urge a bit of

evidence from the Greek text in favor of this theory. It is the word πρότερον in Gal. 4:13. In its original significance this word denoted the *former of two,* as in Heb. 7:27, "*first* (πρότερον) to offer up sacrifice on behalf of his own sins, *then* (ἔπειτα) those of the people." On the assumption that this word as here used means the *former of two,* it is urged that the first visit was Paul's tour of evangelization through the Galatian churches, as described in Acts 13:4–14:28, and that the second visit was the one recorded in Acts 16:1-6. Hence the Galatian letter was written after this second visit; otherwise there would have been no occasion for Paul referring to the tour of evangelization as πρότερον.

But it has been well established that this classical distinction has largely faded out in hellenistic Greek (Moulton and Milligan, *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament,* p. 554); so here it most probably means simply *formerly* or *once.* However, if its classical meaning is to be urged, it fits better into the theory of the early date. If Paul means to indicate the former of two occasions, he would normally have reference to his original visit for evangelization as compared with the return journey for restoration after the scourge of persecution.

This treatment of evidence from the Greek text is not offered as exhaustive, but only suggestive. In grappling with this baffling problem it is well that we observe closely all the phenomena of the Greek text because it may provide intimations which in the final analysis will constitute the determining balance of evidence.

From Off the Campus and On

THE LEADING article in this issue of the CROZER QUARTERLY bids fair to be distinctly of more than passing interest. "Are theological seminaries awake to the problems of a changing world?" is a persistent question today. This question was not propounded in so many words to the several writers; their papers, however, show it is keenly before their eyes. Several of the authors, in accepting the invitation to share in the symposium, expressed their own keen interest to see what their colleagues in other schools would write. Their interest will be shared by graduates of former years who often wonder if they would feel at home were they once more to find themselves back in the old classrooms. The QUARTERLY is glad of the opportunity of making possible an intimate glimpse into schools destined to play an increasingly important part in American life and thought.

What is Christianity? Many have attempted an answer to this elusive question. Many others are frankly skeptical whether any answer is possible. Edgar Sheffield Brightman, a professor of philosophy for many years on the faculty of Boston University, has raised the question anew. Readers of the CROZER QUARTERLY will find it as provoking as did the members of the American Theological Society last April.

The brief article by Theophile J. Meek, of the department of Semitics in the University of Toronto, may serve as a reward for those who have not allowed their Hebrew to slip too far into the background. None is more competent than is he to attempt the delicate task—so frequently essential—of textual emendation of the Hebrew Scriptures. Those who read the *American Translation*—the so-called "Chicago Bible"—will remember Professor Meek as one of its gifted translators.

With Greece in the headlines of the daily press the comprehensive article by Professor Hyde is especially timely. A life-long student of the ancient world, he stands as one of the world authorities on Greek religion. His intimate and first-hand knowledge of modern Greece has resulted in an almost unique knowledge of the modern survival of ancient practices.

Professor Moehlman needs no introduction. His article in the January issue, "To End the Universal Christian Schism," is still news. The present brief statistical study, "Is Roman Catholicism Winning?" will undoubtedly prove of interest.

H. E. Dana is president and professor of New Testament in the Kansas City Baptist Theological Seminary. He is one of a group, not so

small as certain noisy enthusiasts might lead the unwary to suppose, who still feel a knowledge of the Greek text of the New Testament not superfluous for the modern minister.

Among those "from off the campus" who have contributed reviews and notices are Stewart G. Cole, for many years a member of the Crozer faculty and now director of the Service Bureau for Intercultural Education; Frederick B. Igler, Baptist student pastor at the University of Pennsylvania; John W. Brush, recently appointed instructor in church history at the Andover Newton Theological School; David H. Bining of the faculty of the Ridley Park High School; Allan R. Moore of Wilmore, Kentucky, who after graduation from Crozer did graduate work in church history; John L. Foreman, a Presbyterian minister at present studying at Crozer; and Robert E. Keighton of Narberth, a frequent contributor to the QUARTERLY.

BOOK REVIEWS

What We Mean by Religion, by Willard L. Sperry, New York, Harper, 1940, pp. 171, $1.75.

Here is one of the most stimulating books the reviewer has read in many years. It might easily be characterized as a notably satisfying volume for one who is not seeking a formal and final definition or confirmation of traditions, but prefers earnest attempts to face problems for oneself and to feel in his soul the validity of certain religious beliefs which sustain humanity. However, the volume is so packed with rich thought as to defy the condensation necessary in a brief review.

The book is built around five words—religion, faith, prayer, morals, and God—and, in part, it is an attempt to face the honest agnosticism or disbelief on the part of many earnest and highly intelligent seekers after truth as they confront the questions raised by these five words. But it is more than that. It is a revelation of the author's own faith and its basis.

Dean Sperry believes that religion has its roots deep "in man's nature and needs and his place in the universe," and is much further from dying than is sometimes asserted. But he finds that religions accumulate "an inordinate amount of irrelevant stuff," and become "overelaborated intellectually and overdecorated aesthetically." He affirms that Nazism and Communism must be understood primarily in terms of religion; that they are "hot religions" which cannot be dispelled by "lukewarm religions." His own conclusion is that religion is primarily a matter of our own relation to God, but a social corollary follows to the effect that all men are brethren because one is their Father. Apparently he sees little value in humanism.

As to faith, he recognizes that it is absolutely necessary to religion. Faith must acknowledge the facts of science and knowledge in general, but knowledge must grant faith its right "to adventure into the unknown." Man must have such freedom if life is to know its highest possibilities. We would not wish a life with all questions answered.

The subjects of prayer, morals, and God are likewise treated in a way to strengthen one's inner confidence in the reality of the essentials of the Christian religion. Indeed, this reader was so impressed by the book as a whole that he wishes to read it again, unhurriedly, perhaps a page or two a day in a devotional attitude, with opportunity to appropriate and assimilate.

J. H. FRANKLIN

The Development of Religious Toleration in England: Attainment of the Theory and Accommodation in Thought and Institutions (1640–1660), by W. K. Jordan, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1940, pp. 499, $5.00.

Jordan's fourth and final volume in his series on the development of religious tolerance in England is a splendid example of the history of ideas, or what the Germans call *Geistesgeschichte.* Into the thought of numerous thinkers of the turbulent twenty years that led up to the restoration of the monarchy in 1660, Jordan has penetrated with thoroughness and sympathy. Wherever church historians gather, this work is mentioned with profound respect, and no discussion of England's formative years in Protestant history can ignore it. The only open session at

the recent meetings of the American Society of Church History at New York concerned the very years and problems with which Jordan deals in this and his third volume.

Milton, Hobbes, and Jeremy Taylor we all know a little about. To have Jordan fit them into the movement for religious toleration is to see them freshly and in an important light. The Cambridge Platonists are familiar for their hopeful theology and for the mystical flavor which has attracted Dean Inge and many another. Their thought on toleration is not so generally familiar. As to Milton and Hobbes, they wrote too late, says Jordan. The real issue was already as good as settled by the rising tide of religious indifference. The Cambridge Platonists were remote and rather ineffective. Who then used the powerful pens in the cause of religious tolerance? The great Latitudinarians, inspired by Falkland and Chillingworth, are, I think, Jordan's real heroes. Henry Robinson, the London merchant, is important, and is reviewed at length. Then there are Vane and Hale and Sterry and Harrington and a score of others, some of them anonymous. But Jordan, in spite of all his loving labor on the work of these men's minds, tends to discount the power of the man or of the idea. He sees the inevitable working itself out of the chaos of the times, history's clock ticking off the hours despite the push of the liberal or the drag of the conservative.

From the chaos of absolutes in mid-seventeenth century England came an impressive company of men, clerical and lay, who saw that toleration alone would save England from hopeless midnight. The clear absolutes, of course, were the Laudian way and the Presbyterian. But a multiplicity of dogmatic sects also added to the confusion. One result was a lay conviction of the folly of all clerical and churchly pretensions and claims: this fed into the religious indifference that is still a large sector of the common mind in England and the United States. A fairer fruit was the intellectual and spiritual breadth of the clerics who could rise above party strife and plead "a love of God . . . . broader than the measure of man's mind." A common denominator of all these protests in the name of religious liberty was the individualism which was to be decidedly subversive of all dogmatic and institutional religion. Religion comes to be more and more a private commerce between one man and his God.

I have but touched the outer surface of a rich book. The writing is picturesque and full. (One could wish for variations of the constant use of "the tuition of history" and "the tuition of experience.") The reading of the book would sharpen the preacher's pulpit weapons. Jordan's copious use of simile and metaphor is certainly an echo of the vivid language employed by the men he is interpreting, men who fought valiantly in a battle that may not yet be considered won.

JOHN WOOLMAN BRUSH

The Springs of Creative Living, by Rollo May, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1940, pp. 271, $2.00.

Sigmund Freud, C. G. Jung, and Alfred Adler are drafted as allies of the Christian cause! That is the thesis of this book. It is claimed that the psychoanalyst has discovered fundamental truths about the nature of personality and its functioning which the churchman needs to take account of in order to make his services intelligent and effective. The author not only explores the practical aspects of "depth psychology" in his presentation of so-called case studies, but he relates the

concepts of the secular study with those of historic theology to indicate how the latter may be revitalized and thereby perpetuated. Rollo May writes out of a critical acquaintance with the materials in both fields.

We need more books of this general type. Most of the religious publications to date which mention Freud and his disciples have dealt unjustly with these men. They have criticized the less tenable hypotheses of Freudianism at the expense of honoring verifiable claims. The principles of charity and discrimination were not practiced with a view to preserving to the Christian tradition elements of personality-interpretation which would definitely have enriched the forces of religion. In fact, the truth about religion, viewed as a human quest, would itself have been enhanced by due recognition of its psychological bearings.

The Springs of Creative Living illustrates how difficult it is to accomplish a high-minded purpose in these respects. The depth of personality is plumbed to suggest that the "springs" of behavior are emotive, subtle, powerful. Personality health can be maintained neither by giving way to romantic "self-expression" nor by enduring a regime of authoritarianism. It is insured by restraining the tendency to libertinism with the "structure of life" which is what the author means by God. Human life is thus controlled by bi-polar tensions when it is happily enlisted. It then takes on a dependable core of meaning.

The author sees a direct connection between particular types of arrests of personality and the prevailing shortcomings of its social environment. It is doubtful, however, if he sticks closely to this axiom. Indeed, that is the weakness of Freudian theory. It does not pay sufficient heed to the impact of a decadent culture upon persons; it rests its case too lightly on a diagnosis of untoward drives of personality. For instance, the author rightly makes much of the need for a measure of security for individuals if they are to remain "normal." In analyzing the grounds for insecurity of his patients (he is a practicing psychotherapist as well as a minister), he falls back repeatedly on the sex concept to explain maladjustment, and overworks it. The tragic imperialistic, industrial, and economic confusions of our times that thwart people, arresting the normal activity of family, community, and nation, are disregarded as major contributing factors to personality breakdown.

The same misdirection of cause and effect may be detected also in May's references to the theistic concept. He seeks support for his idea of God in the lore of a quasi-liberal Protestant theology. If he had continued to trust the scientific spirit which dominates his study, he would have sought the activity and nature of divine reality in cosmic behavior directly and in its bearing upon man's mundane economy. Harmonistic interests bulk larger than "creative" inquiry in his treatment of the theological sanctions of religion.

Undoubtedly the author has met with considerable success in his dealings with sick souls. The reader will catch his contagion and desire to go and do likewise. The principles of common sense cheerfully practiced will be productive of good results. But to aspire to professional competency in this supremely difficult art calls for substantial education in (a) the psychology of personality *and* culture, (b) the resources of religion, and, what is most difficult of all, (c) the functional relations between persons in culture and religious adventuresomeness.

STEWART G. COLE

The Ephesian Tradition: An Oral Source of the Fourth Gospel, by H. E. Dana, Kansas City, Kansas City Seminary Press, 1940, pp. 195, $1.00.

The author of this modest little volume, or, as he prefers to call it, dissertation, has approached the question of the Fourth Gospel from a new angle, *viz.*, that of form criticism. After outlining his views of the growth of the three Synoptic gospels and classifying nine different forms of materials, produced in the pregospel days by early Christians, from which these gospels were framed, he turns to John and argues that precisely the same phenomena are to be found there. Such passages as 2:13-22, 6:1-15, and 12:12-19, respectively the Cleansing of the Temple, Feeding of the 5000, and Triumphal Entry, are as truly pericopæ as are their fellows in the Synoptics. Furthermore, the neighboring passages are of a genuinely pericopate nature. Thus he can analyze the gospel into five sections (exclusive of the prologue which is a compound of the stanzas of an early hymn and a pericope of didactic construction, and of the appendix which he views as a piece of historical tradition, which the author of the rest of the gospel added just before it was released for publication): 1:18—4:54; 5:1—10:39; 10:40—13:30; 13:31—17:26; 18:1—20:31. These sections, he argues, are all to be seen as made up of pericopæ which for the most part are the outgrowth of evangelic tradition, although their organization and often the connective tissue show the handiwork of the author.

This material was not evolved by the author. It was for the most part tradition which had grown up in Ephesus. He sees in it a Palestinian substratum brought from Jerusalem via Cæsarea (the transfer station for Jerusalem tradition to the gentile world as Antioch was for the Galilean), a Pauline stratum, and an Ephesian stratum reflecting local issues.

The student will learn much from this book, although, if he is like me, he will find constant, if not continuous, grounds for vigorous dissent. I totally disagree with the theory that, although the worthies whose names are attached to books did not write them, they probably did write a substantial source. Dana wholeheartedly accepts this position, although he candidly refers to Cadbury's altogether justified condemnation of it. Furthermore, while I recognize the probability of the growth of materials in different centres prior to the days of the written gospels, I am very skeptical of the supposed compends of these materials which the evangelists found ready to hand and which they deftly spliced together. I am particularly skeptical of his appraisal of the discourse material of John: It is not the exact reproduction of the original Aramaic teaching of Jesus, yet it really represents, if not the teaching of Jesus, Jesus the Teacher, and goes back to him though not to his exact words. "Jesus did not speak these things directly to the unprepared ears of the Galilean disciples, but he spoke them across the years to the cultured heart of the Ephesian church, and a noble leader of that church made record of what they heard." I found this and similar statements most annoying and perplexing until on a later page I found him confessing that he was both "a scientific student" and "a worshiper at the throne of grace divine," who found it enriched his religious life "far more to contemplate him in the simple light of their [the early Christian] religious convictions than in the rather shadowy perspective of modern scholarship" (p. 146).

To me the whole theory of authorship and of the open pipelines from Jerusalem and Galilee is most unconvincing. The book will be of value to those who have felt the denial that John, the son of Zebedee, wrote the fourth gospel strips the gospel of its power. (They will probably also rejoice that though they must

give John up as author of the gospel they can still have him as the author of the Revelation.) On the other hand, Dana is right: The gulf between the Synoptists and John is less wide than has frequently been argued. This needs to be emphasized. That means, however, I am convinced, not that John is more like them, but that they are more like John. This change of emphasis is by no means simply a *bon mot.*

One final word must be spoken. The printing of the book is inexcusably bad. Faulty punctuation, bad spelling, jargon when German is quoted, and other frequent slips abound. The printer who set the type and the proofreader who let these by are not in their right callings.

MORTON S. ENSLIN

Liberal Education in a Democracy, by Stewart G. Cole, New York, Harper, 1940, pp. viii, 309, $3.00.

A subtitle interestingly reveals the author's purpose, "A Charter for the American College." His critical examination of liberal education in the American college reveals a disintegrative state almost resembling chaos. Another reviewer has written with insight, "The author has done an excellent job in developing a coherent purpose and plan to take the place of the diverse elements now confusedly mingled in college programs." Education in America should be a quest for social democracy, integrity of personal character, employment of the scientific method in all of life, æsthetic sensitivity, and personal religion—all these being served and enriched by "a versatile language." These constitute the six chief educational objectives which are set forth, appraised, and validated in educational policy and practice.

Two of these objectives I point out as of particular interest to readers of the CROZER QUARTERLY, namely, "æsthetic sensitivity" and "personal religion." Any valid educational process has to do with the total person; man is not only a thinking animal, but also a feeling animal. He lives not only in the world of truth but also in a world of beauty. The growing person who is being educated should be led to feel at home in the world of beauty, the æsthetic world. Education which does not do this for him betrays him and robs him. Dr. Cole's chapter on "The Insights of the Esthetic Sense" constitutes a very great and distinct contribution to educational theory.

Chapter VIII, "A Religious Philosophy of Life," demands a liberal education with an overarching sky, so to speak. The so-called Christian college has maintained this ideal in American education, but with the rise of the great universities, generally under State control, religion has steadily declined and generally disappeared as a discipline in education. This is a far-reaching and tragic omission; religion must be restored. Naturally the author is not interested in a restoration of prescientific varieties of Christianity which raise the banner of "fundamentalism," but rather in those great and valid insights which comport with and sustain scientific understandings. Such a religion is essential if we are to give meaning to life in the contemporary world.

W. R. MCNUTT

Let the Church Be the Church, by Elmer George Homrighausen, New York, Abingdon, 1940, pp. 199, $2.00.

So far as is known, this title was coined in an address by one of the younger delegates at the Oxford Conference in 1937, as Dr. Homrighausen indicates, and the reader opens the volume with the expectation of some consistent treatment of the theme throughout the ten chapters.

The heading of the first chapter is chosen for the title of the book, and is a forthright statement as to the weakness and failures of the church, its conformity to the world, its lack of Christ-likeness, its divisions and otherworldliness. In the same chapter there is a call for repentance on the part of the church, and to wake up to the crisis of our times. Apathy must give way to alarm. More aggressiveness is required. Christianity must be realized as a dynamic in the world. "Christianity is contemporary life-in-Christ." The church needs conversion. Some of its unholy alliances have enslaved it to undesirable allies. The church must become the channel through which God may speak to the world. It is the continuing incarnation of Christ. Churches must unite on world evangelization and realistic social action.

The other nine chapters appear, as is suggested in the dedication, to have been sermons and addresses which the author had delivered in various assemblies. Here, they are included with only slight adaptation to the title of the book. Many readers will find all of the chapters interesting and helpful even though for the most part they seem to have been prepared without particular reference to the volume's theme, which stirred us deeply when we heard it first at Oxford.

J. H. FRANKLIN

These Shared His Cross, Edwin McNeill Poteat, New York, Harper, 1941, pp. xvi, 192, $1.75.

Looking toward the Easter period in the life of the churches, I am happy to review and commend this volume. Dr. Poteat has an ever increasing reading public which has been taught to expect religious insight, downright honesty, and literary merit in his writings. In none of these will there be disappointment with *These Shared His Cross.* The reader will welcome the absence of that maudlin sentimentality too generally found in those who write concerning the cross of our Lord. Here, on the contrary, is a study worthy of that dynamic, courageous, divine man who died on Calvary's cross.

The book is constructed thus: seven chapters, each of which is divided into two parts. Part One in each case is a character study of one who shared his cross, and Part Two applies the truth, revealed in that character, to contemporary life. A study of the prætorian guard (in Chap. I) leads on to a consideration of what the Cross has to say to the cruel; Symon of Cyrene, a man of means gives cause to consider "The Cross and Wealth"; women who wept around his cross suggest a consideration of "The Cross and the Family"; those who passed by constitute a text for, "The Cross and Liberalism"; while a consideration of Nicodemus and Joseph asks orthodoxy to consider what the cross has to say to its proverbial tendency to yield nothing, learn nothing, and win nothing.

One cannot read, *These Shared His Cross* without sensing that the author sifts all hearts as he brings them for judgment before the cross; no reader will feel himself spared.

W. R. MCNUTT

War Propaganda and the United States, by Harold Lavine and James Wechsler, New Haven, Yale University Press, 1940, pp. 355.

One of our radio commentators frequently announces, "What I have been saying is propaganda, but don't forget that the messages which come out of ——— are also propaganda."

Propaganda is an old word which has come to have a sinister meaning. Its use in connection with modern war has become especially disturbing. Who doesn't recall the use made of the atrocity stories of World War No. 1 and the hysteria which followed? How many of us would dare say we were not influenced by the paid agents of either side of the conflict? And then when sanity (?) came with the Armistice, how we kicked ourselves around the block!

Well, another war is on, and both sides are competing for mastery of our foreign policy. There is no known device which is not employed in the struggle. Have you been aware of the subtlety of the attack?

One of the recent additions to the educational process has been the organization of "The Institute for Propaganda Analysis," committed to helping the average citizen to distinguish and choose between rival propagandas. The Institute has been rendering a real service in many fields and in the special edition on *War Propaganda and the United States* a very timely service to the American people. Reading this book, one has a sense of great forces shaping not only his own thinking but the thinking of the American people as a whole. Just before one closes the book and finally tries to arrive at conclusions, there ought to be a period for laughter—at one's self and the propagandist. Have you said: "They can't do that to me?" Make your answer after the period of laughter.

FREDERICK B. IGLER

An Exegetical Grammar of the Greek New Testament, by William Douglas Chamberlain, New York, Macmillan, 1941, pp. xxi, 233, $4.00.

There is always room for another grammar of the Greek New Testament. Professor Chamberlain has sought to make this volume a convenient tool for the student to use in exegesis. Thus he concerns himself primarily with the task of presenting the facts of grammar in such a way that they will be immediately available for interpretation. With a competent teacher the book may well prove very useful. It would appear to me, however, to have distinct drawbacks as a text for the student or minister who desires to learn Greek by himself. Despite its apparent completeness, it leaves many questions, bound to arise, unanswered and, not infrequently, unglimpsed.

Chamberlain is a pupil of A. T. Robertson and shares that grammarian's views. Many are his references to the latter's *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research,* and always with unqualified approbation. Thus he agrees in the classification of conditions as "determined and undetermined." To one accustomed to the distinctly different classification adopted by Farrar, Goodwin, and Burton there seem to be losses even if accompanied perhaps occasionally by gains. To me the discussion of the participle is quite unsatisfactory, particularly in the matter of the treatment of the modal force. I feel the classification of *attributive, circumstantial,* and *supplementary* far more convenient than Chamberlain's *attributive* and *predicative,* into which latter group he dumps participles used as predicate adjectives (including the so-called periphrastic), supplementary participles in indirect discourse (he calls them "complementary" and fails completely to distinguish between the supplementary participle in strict indirect discourse and the participle which is an integral part of the object), and the circumstantial participle. It appears to me that this awkward and oversimple classification is in part responsible, for example, for the unwarranted view that the participle in

indirect discourse indicates "actual experience" in contrast to the infinitive which expresses "intellectual apprehension."

Furthermore, it appears to me most unwise to harp on the eight cases. Every competent Greek grammarian recognizes that Greek descended from a language that had an ablative, a locative, and an instrumental case in addition to the classic five. But, in Greek, as we know it, these cases, to all intents and purposes, have been absorbed. Perhaps it was largely due to the fact that the genitive and ablative came to have identical forms that these originally diverse functions were combined in the more lusty genitive. It seems to me idle and pedantic to go through the gestures of writing eight cases and differentiating between *περί* with the genitive and *περί* with the ablative. The teacher may very well point out why it is that seemingly divergent functions appear to be found in the present genitive and in the dative. More than that for the elementary student appears to me quite unnecessary.

No two grammarians will see eye to eye on all points. While there are points where I would disagree with the author, I am by no means unaware of the many genuine excellencies of this volume. Many of the passages he has cited as examples of this construction or that are really illumined by his skillful comment. His insistence that true exegesis can result only as the verse in question is read in its context and that not infrequently the exact force of the construction in question—be it case, preposition, or meaning of a word—will be evident only in view of its context is needed. The care which has been shown in cleansing the volume of those misprints which modern printers so love to produce when they try to set Greek is altogether admirable.

MORTON S. ENSLIN

A Preface to Christian Theology, by John A. Mackay, New York, Macmillan, 1941, pp. x, 187, $2.00.

This volume by the president of the Princeton Theological Seminary is no more than its title states. Its endeavor is not to furnish us with finished theological formulations concerning God, Christ, the Spirit, the Word, man, or any of the other numerous subjects which demand the systematization of the Christian thinker. Its attempt is rather to inspire Christian people to participate in first-hand association with Christian faith and truth that out of this a life-rooted theology may emerge.

In his repeated declaration that theology should grow out of the Christian's personal contact with truth, the author emphasizes a fact which is too often forgotten. Frequently theology is fashioned by the armchair onlooker rather than by the man who has known the heat of life's struggle, the thrust of the evil opposition, and the compelling drive of Christian idealism. Dr. Mackay's fresh way of putting these diverse approaches to theological truth is through the symbols of the balcony and the road. Those who have a balcony approach to truth are spectators sitting above the bitterness of life's press and strain, bringing "truth" out of their own thought. Aristotle, the Greek, and Renan, the Frenchman, are cited as examples of this unsatisfactory approach. They are mere spectators, not participants in the fury of life. Such never really discover God or man, since they treat them as entities to be observed, but not to be experienced.

In contrast to the balcony approach to truth is that of the road. Here one discovers truth as one experiences it as participant in it. "The Road is the symbol of a first-hand experience of reality where thought, born of a living concern, issues

in decision and action" (p. 44). Sören Kierkegaard is presented as a typical example of this approach. The point here is that if we are going to know ultimate things, we must get out of the balcony and into the road. Without such personal commitment there can be no discovery of righteousness.

In true Barthian fashion, Dr. Mackay invalidates the quest for ultimate truth through nature and culture. These are "bypaths," yea blindalleys, so far as direct traces of "the personal Righteousness" which the pilgrim desires are concerned. He discovers at long last that "God meets man in Jesus Christ" (p. 70). Here is the Christian way to the understanding of all that God is and that man is. In this Dr. Mackay is but echoing Karl Barth's view to the effect that only the primary revelation in Christ is valid, the secondary revelation in nature and history bringing us nothing worthy of the name. Jesus is "the personal Truth" and he is sufficient.

One especially valuable insight in this volume lies in the contention that "truth is in order of goodness." Goodness is "willing what God wills." Since truth is in God and not in ideas about him, we have a personal obligation to him to realize goodness in ourselves. Knowing this, we discover truth through goodness. Through such a life of goodness we are delivered from one of the deadly sins within the Christian community; namely, making dogmatic truth a substitute for moral goodness. This has long been the heresy of Protestant orthodoxy. Concludes Dr. Mackay: "We really need orthodox doctrine today more than ever we needed it before. But wherever loyalty to doctrine becomes a substitute for loyalty to God, the consequences are devastating" (p. 125).

The book is heartily recommended to preacher and layman alike as a brief volume for stimulation, insight, and enlightenment.

GEORGE W. DAVIS

Can Christianity Save Civilization? by Walter M. Horton, New York, Harper, 1940, pp. xii, 271, $2.00.

In a recent issue of the CROZER QUARTERLY this reviewer strongly commended Hocking's latest book, *Living Religions and a World Religion.* It is here suggested that the study of that book be followed by the reading of this new work by Professor Horton. If ministers generally were lifted out of their parochial boundaries into a view of the horizons which these men see, their preaching would no longer be called irrelevant to world affairs. From this perspective the world mission of Christianity would become the central concern of the churches, local responsibilities gaining their real significance in relation to the larger obligation.

Beginning with an investigation of the relation of religion to culture, illustrated particularly in the history of culture in the Far East, Professor Horton surveys the part which Christianity has played in the development of Western civilization and then discusses the modern intermingling of these cultures, a process in which Western civilization has been the dominating factor. Can this intercommunicating world, which has become physically one, unite spiritually and morally? If it cannot, is there any prospect for a world civilization? "The world has specific ethical problems today, which must be specifically faced, first in thought and then in action, if a unified world is to come into being. Of major importance among these specific problems are those which have to do with conflicts of values and conflicts of loyalties" (p. 173). Can the Christian religion supply the unifying values, the central loyalty? Dr. Horton cherishes no illusions about the ability of the existing churches,

as they are now constituted, to supply these needs, but he is not a prophet of doom. "Our churches tend to reflect their environment instead of tending to transform it as they did in the days of their creative power" (p. 221). But Christianity again and again has shown that it has within itself a power of self-transformation and revitalization. There are already "signs of renewal in the life of the older churches" and amazing vitality in some of the younger churches in so-called mission lands. A wide reading of this prophetic book would surely hasten the Christian renaissance which this hour in history demands.

GORDON POTEAT

The World's Need of Christ, by Charles A. Ellwood, New York, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1940, pp. 237, $2.00.

Our present culture is decidedly sensate, *i. e.,* dominated by sense impressions and sense satisfactions. Perhaps the main cause of the present condition of our world has been the lack of a spiritual leadership with adequate intelligence. Our present problem is not that God is ignored, but that Christ is ignored. The solution lies in the complete imitation of the spirit of Christ. Love must be extended beyond the personal to the social and the national, and spiritual values are absolutely necessary for both the individual and the group. Only then are we Christian.

This, briefly, is our author's thesis. He expands this formula throughout the spheres of science, philosophy, the church, business, industry, politics, and international relations.

Science, in formulating its laws, has depended upon the impressions made by the phenomenal world upon normal human senses. "The essential work of science," however, "is not fact-finding, but the testing of hypotheses produced by imaginative insights; and these hypotheses may come from religion, art, literature, as well as from the imagination of the investigator" (p. 63).

The province of philosophy is the rational ordering of values, but modern philosophy tends to be individualistic and non-Christian, ignoring any bases in the social sciences. The Church has emphasized the equality of all the Scriptures, whether Old Testament, Jesus, or Paul; has been concerned with a non-Jesus theology and generally, in its concern for temporal power, has stepped down its teachings to the level of the prevailing *mores.*

"Both property and industry as we find them existing in our world have grown up in connection with war" (p. 117). Still, since the true figure of man's interrelationship is the family, where the individual is important as a person and yet is developed for and by his contribution to the whole of which he is an important part, business and industry must abandon their insubordination to these higher values of life and devote themselves to the redemption of mankind, where the basis of conduct is not justice but love.

Our present State originated in the exigencies of war and is established so that the end of political action is power. Etiquette, but not morality, exists between nations. The true Christian nation would imitate the Christian law of family life, where all would be done for the good of all. National sacrifice and love for others would be practiced, and the individual good will would be expressed through national machinery.

Dr. Ellwood has produced a book whose whole theme is the imitation of Christ in the individual and, more particularly, in every group of which the individual is

a part. The church must become Jesus Christ alive in the world today and must restore to spiritual values their inherent superiority over sensate values. The author opposes the individualistic view of religion and any form of modern, sympathetic, leveling "liberalism."

A mere statement of the book's theme will seem to suggest that here is nothing essentially new. That is true, how could there be on such a subject? Yet readers of Charles Ellwood's previous books know that he has an impressive way of presenting unexpected implications of a theme, as well as challenging statements about its way of being put into practice.

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON

Commonwealth or Anarchy? A Survey of the Projects of Peace from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Century, by Sir John A. R. Marriott, New York, Columbia University Press, 1939, pp. 227, $2.00.

This book sets forth the more important projects of peace from the sixteenth to the twentieth century. The attempt is made to set each one against its appropriate historical background; and, although the history is sketchily drawn, enough detail is given to evaluate the project. The author has included a wealth of material in such a small book. Beginning with the great design of Henry IV, he next touches upon the work of such men as Crucé, Grotius, Hobbes, Penn, Saint-Pierre, Bellers, Rousseau, Bentham, and Kant. His account of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries deals more with the effects of events on the peace movement than with individuals. He indicates the peace implications of the Holy Alliance, the Quadruple Alliance, the peace societies, the Manchester School, the arbitration movement, and the peace conferences. Naturally, the League of Nations occupies a large place in the book. Post-war events affecting peace are also analyzed.

In criticizing the book one must remember that the purpose of the author is not to write history. This does not justify, however, the occasional misinterpretation placed on the facts enumerated. The author's heightened pro-British attitude has lowered his ability as an historian. The reader is constantly made aware by word or implication that the British Empire is a saint in a world of sinning nations.

The book in places appears to be hastily written. It is hard to understand how an author of such standing could err in placing the United States as a member of the Court of International Justice in 1928. One wonders also if it is correct to say that the United States "defaulted" in not entering the League of Nations, or that in the refusal to accept the Treaty of Versailles the United States "dishonored the signature of its principal delegate." In like manner the author shows ignorance of American practice by blaming the American Senate for the bad position in which France was placed as a result of the failure of the Anglo-American Treaty guaranteeing the frontiers of France.

Despite the few errors and misinterpretations, the book is a mine of information on the topic of international peace. In these days of war when men are once again turning to projects of peace, the book will prove an important text in indicating or reminding what thinking has been done and what work has been accomplished in that important field. The criticisms of the League of Nations and the laudation of the British Empire as an example for world peace are interesting discussions. The book could profitably be read by all leaders who are interested in world peace.

DAVID H. BINING

Scholasticism and Politics, by Jacques Maritain, translation edited by Mortimer J. Adler, New York, Macmillan, 1940, pp. viii, 248, $2.50.

It is not easy to present an orderly statement of the contents of this volume. While it purports to deal with scholasticism and politics, these are but two of the many interests which enter its pages. The book impressed me as being not the systematic pursuit of one subject, but rather the crown of a philosopher, in which he had placed his philosophic gems without too much concern about the pattern. After reading the book with some care, it strikes me that its value is not in any persistent treatment of the relation between scholasticism and politics, but rather in the choice insights and conceptions of this philosophic mind from modern France. Herein, moreover, lies its chief value for the reader. Time and time again he will stop, look, and pick up some precious jewel as it falls from this philosopher's rich crown.

Instead, therefore, of doing the well-nigh impossible—giving a systematic statement of the thought of the book—I want to set down some of these philosophic gems which arrested my attention.

A humanism, which considers man in the wholeness of his natural and supernatural being, and which sets no *a priori* limit to the descent of the divine into man, we may call the *humanism of the Incarnation* (p. 9).

And so, as a counterpart to the words of Pascal which I have just quoted, "the *ego* is hateful," we must remember the words of St. Thomas: "The person is that which is noblest in the whole of nature" (p. 57).

Man is constituted a person, made for God and for eternal life, before being constituted part of a human community; and he is constituted part of familial society before being constituted part of political society. Hence, there are primordial rights, which the latter must respect, and which it dare not wrong when it demands for itself the aid of its members because they are its parts (p. 76).

Democracy is only real if it is *immanent* to the people itself, and ordained to the *immanent* common good of the people (p. 108).

To foresee *with certitude* what this *particular man* will do after inner reflexion and deliberation, and by the exercise of his *free will*—that is something which you cannot do. It is this man's *absolute secret,* and it is a secret even *for himself,* a secret which he will learn only at the very moment when he makes his decision (p. 129).

Man must win his personality, as well as his freedom, and he pays dearly for it, and runs many risks. He is a person in the order of doing only if his rational energies, and virtues, and love, give such a face to the torrential multipicity which inhabits him, and freely imprint on him the seal of his radical, ontological unity. In this sense . . . . one knows real personality and real liberty . . . . (p. 135).

When explaining the words of Jesus: "Know ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" St. John of the Cross, that great doctor of contemplation, liked to recall Dionysius's sentence: the divinest of all things divine, is to coöperate with God in the salvation of souls (p. 182).

Such passages, I trust, may bring you the aroma of the book, whetting your appetite for the full reading of it.

GEORGE W. DAVIS

Quaker Education in Theory and Practice, by Howard H. Brinton, Wallingford (Penna.), Pendle Hill, 1940, pp. 136, $0.75 (cloth), $0.50 (paper).

The Friends have not allowed their dependence upon the Inner Light for personal and group guidance to dull their appreciation of the values of education, in which field they have had notable success. Mr. Brinton's book is a clear and concise statement of their philosophy of education, with the frank admission that the purpose of Quaker education is the "perpetuation of the Quaker way of life." The nature of this way of life is discussed as it is manifested in the doctrine of the

"Inner Light," in the meetings for worship and for business, and in the social outlook. After briefly outlining the history of Quaker education, particularly in America, and describing the educational policies of the Friends in the past, the writer takes up the problem of the probable direction of future developments. It is admitted that the Quaker philosophy of education was most effective from 1750 to 1850, and that since that time it has been gradually becoming less effective. With the decline of the "Quaker cultural pattern" the Quaker schools have gradually lost sight of the goal of preparing for a "special community," largely because such a community no longer exists in distinctive form.

The hope is expressed that the schools may become laboratories in which a distinctive way of life may be worked out for the present time, based upon "fundamental Quaker principles," and an effort is made to chart its course by landmarks already established by experience. "The power which can be developed in small groups devoted to silent worship and meditation" must be rediscovered. "A school must be developed which enlarges the apprehension and awareness not only of the surface of the mind . . . . but of the deeper levels which move the will." The task of Quaker education is presented as threefold: "It must be at once authoritative, rational and mystical, with emphasis upon the authoritative in childhood, on the rational in youth and on the mystical in maturity. All three, however, must always in some degree be present."

It is impossible to do justice to the values in this book in a brief review. Taken with its companion volumes, "Creative Worship" and "Divine Human Society" it furnishes an authoritative and comprehensive portrayal of the fundamental doctrines of Friends in their practical applications.

RITTENHOUSE NEISSER

The Kantian Philosophy of Space, by Christopher Browne Garnett, Jr., New York, Columbia University Press, 1939, pp. xi, 287, $3.50.

This volume, written by an associate professor of philosophy at George Washington University, has as its aim "a critical examination of Kant's views of space as he developed them between 1747 and 1787." As a background to this development the views of his two main predecessors—Newton and Leibniz—are considered, while the study is completed with a brief statement of the views on space of three contemporary thinkers, S. Alexander, H. N. Whitehead, and C. D. Broad.

It is impossible here to do more than suggest the main developments in Kant's concept of space. In his early thinking he found space to be dependent upon an order in certain substances. As these substances interact upon each other and outside of themselves, space is created. So Kant concluded that this action is indirectly the basis of that which we call space. He presented this view in his earliest writing on space, first published in 1747.

In 1768 Kant wrote a paper entitled, *On the First Ground of the Distinction of Regions in Space,* in which his thesis was "that absolute space has a reality of its own, independent of the existence of all matter, and indeed as the first ground of the possibility of the compositeness of matter." Here he moves to the view that there is an absolute space as an entity existing in its own right since it has a necessary nature. It is in no way dependent on matter. It is, moreover, the first ground of the possibility of matter being composed. Such is a summary of the view held by Kant in 1768.

In the following year the philosopher of Königsberg effected further developments in his theory of space, emphasizing 1. that space is a pure intuition and a pure form of empirical intuition and 2. that space is metaphysically unreal. In this second view it would appear that Kant abandons his earlier position of the objectivity of space. He writes: "Space is not something objective and real, neither substance, nor accident, nor relation, but subjective and ideal." But these words must not be interpreted as meaning that he forsakes his position that space is objective. He still holds to space as empirically real in the sense that it is concrete and intuitive. What he did mean by such a statement is that space is metaphysically ideal, *i.e.,* that it is "neither a real substance, nor an accident, nor a relation, but merely the form of an unreal world of appearances" (p. 140).

The final developments in Kant's theory of space receive statement in his *Critique of Pure Reason,* 1781 and 1787. Here he argues that space is nonempirical, necessary, a pure intuition, and an infinite magnitude given prior to sense experience and "perception." In the latter pages of the famous critique, Kant went even beyond these positions which seem to make space a reality independent of mind. Therein he came to regard space not as a reality presented to the mind, but constructed by it. Mind is an active force, "constrained to carry out an activity, and space is the result of this activity" (p. 207). This means that space is gained ultimately from an activity of the creative mental power of the individual. Here Kant rests his case.

This volume will be chiefly of value to the specialist in philosophy who desires to explore this particular concept of space. The average reader will have little interest in it unless he is bent on sharpening his philosophic wits.

GEORGE W. DAVIS

History of the Norwegian Baptists in America, by Peder Stiansen, Chicago, Norwegian Baptist Conference of America, and Philadelphia, American Baptist Publication Society, 1939, pp. 344, $2.50.

The question as to the competence of the author is most important in connection with any published history. The fitness of Dr. Stiansen to write the story of the Norwegian Baptists in America is evident. Born in Norway, he came to America for his education, and struggled through college, seminary, and university, gaining the Th.M. and Ph.D. degrees. He was pastor of churches in America and in Norway, and now occupies the chair of church history in the Northern Baptist Theological Seminary of Chicago. Among the many books of which he is author is a *History of the Baptists in Norway.*

After an interesting chapter on the land and people of Norway and another on Norwegians in America, the author portrays the life of Hans Valder, the pioneer Baptist preacher among the Norwegians of this country, and the first ordained Norwegian Baptist minister in the world, and gives an account of the church organized through his efforts in La Salle County, Illinois, under the name, "The Norwegian Baptist Church of Indian Creek."

From this small beginning has grown the widespread work of the Norwegian Baptists. The book describes the pioneer period in Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, Chicago, and the Dakotas, and the later developments in these and other areas. It gives an account of the effort to provide theological education, culminating in the

union of the Norwegian and Northern Baptist Seminaries. It recounts the story of the organization and work of the Norwegian Baptist Conference of America. Pictures of leaders and churches and a well selected bibliography are among its valuable features.

This volume has been well called "a monumental piece of work." It gives a graphic account of the religious contribution made to American life by one of the sturdiest of the foreign-speaking groups. It will doubtless stand permanently as the unrivaled source book in its field. Those who are interested in the preservation of the records of the struggles and achievements of the past may well rejoice that Dr. Stiansen made it his paramount purpose "to describe the pioneer period before it would be almost impossible to get hold of the source material for that period."

RITTENHOUSE NEISSER

The Two Humanities, by D. R. Davies, New York, Harper, 1940, pp. 256, $2.50.

D. R. Davies, a pastor in an industrial parish in Wales, has written a provocative book. This book is punctuated with extreme and phrenetic language; it contains certain highly fantastic speculations set forth as if they were real solutions of extremely difficult problems, as, for example, the idea that the Fall of Man occurred in a preëarthly existence—the author's attempt to reconcile theology and biology. It will be unfortunate, however, if these eccentricities discourage the reader from going through the whole of the book. (They almost discouraged me.) Strange as it may seem, after what has just been said, the author has things to say which are of great importance and in the midst of the fog clear patches of sky appear again and again. There can be no doubt that he is dealing with life and death issues as regards Christian faith and that he wrestles with them with courage and realism. His subtitle is: *An Attempt at a Christian Interpretation of History in the Light of War.* The "two humanities" are the humanity of unredeemed nature and the humanity of nature as redeemed by Christ. Pride and the will-to-power characterize the first, humility and the will-to-love, the second. Can human nature be remade? The author has no easy illusions as to that undertaking. "The contemporary necessity of Christianizing civilized man is a thousand times more difficult than Catholic Rome's job of civilizing the barbarian. How can we penetrate through his thick skin to his thin soul?" He considers that Christian liberalism has largely failed in this responsibility because of its miscalculation of the depth of man's egoism and its belief in automatic evolutionary progress. His own solution is no return to effete theologies of the past though he does propose a return to the radical prescriptions of the New Testament. (He is the author of a previous volume entitled *"On the Orthodoxy,* which was a selection of the British Religious Book Club.) It will be a very valuable educational and spiritual experience if one takes this book and, with pencil in hand, argues with its author on the margins as he reads. I have done so, and marked down many question marks and more than one caveat, but at the same time have been deeply stirred by the discernment with which the author reaches the heart of many of the issues he is discussing.

GORDON POTEAT

BOOK NOTICES

Protestantism's Hour of Decision, by Justin Wroe Nixon, Philadelphia, Judson Press, 1940, pp. 154, $1.39.

In the October *Reader's Digest,* Channing Pollock explains why he does not go to church. He says: "We find most preachers less concerned with our pressing problems of here and now than with vague promises of future reward. . . . . We find the kind of 'religion' they offer . . . . a philosophy largely without meaning in our modern world."

This book by Dr. Nixon is in large part made up of lectures which he delivered to preachers in Ohio and North Carolina and other parts. This reviewer heard the lectures in Ohio and can testify to the keen interest which the assembled preachers took in them. Every lecture had immediate relation to our modern world. Dr. Nixon belongs to a considerable company of men, now teaching in the seminaries which prepare men for the ministry, whose philosophy of life, while deeply rooted in an ancient tradition (his first chapter is entitled, "The Enduring Christian Faith"), compels them to grasp the nettle of the most prickly problems which the twentieth century puts in their hands. "Protestantism and Democracy," "The Economic Crisis," "The Struggle for International Order"—are these themes, which Dr. Nixon treats, "ivory tower" matters? "What is required at the present turning point in human affairs is not a new principle, but the critical and daring application to new areas of an old principle, whose adaptability to problems of varying scale has already been clearly proven" (p. 137). If there are preachers whose message is irrelevant to the times (and there are!), this vigorous "Tract for the Times" ought to wake them from their dreams (if they can be got to read it).

GORDON POTEAT

Reaching The Unchurched, by Alfred L. Murray, New York, Round Table Press, 1940, pp. 150, $1.50.

Dr. Murray, pastor of the First Baptist Church, Lansdale, Pa., has been very successful in recruiting people for Christ and thus has earned the right to give us this volume. It is not written primarily for the minister, but for the consecrated lay people who wish to do the work of evangelists. It is written simply and directly; in the reviewer's judgment it is well adapted to meet the need of the lay evangelist. An earlier volume by this author is entitled, *The Evangelistic Congregation;* the present writing assumes an evangelistic people, not only willing but anxious to win others to an outspoken allegiance to Christ as Lord. This book should be both inspiration and teacher for such "personal workers."

Some will think the theological assumptions unnecessarily conservative and the language a bit overpious; even so, these will be able to find values regardless of the label on the vessel.

W. R. MCNUTT

The Christian Fellowship, by Nels F. S. Ferré, New York, Harper, 1940, pp. ix, 236, $2.00.

This is a scholarly piece of work, and demands of the reader a wide knowledge of current literature. For example: it would be well to read Professor Anders

Nygren's work, *Agape and Eros,* before tackling the chapter on the "Continuity of the Christian Faith," and to dip into Hinduism from the sources given by the author in the footnotes prior to reading the chapter on "Christianity and Karma."

Dr. Ferré's purpose in this book is to further the possibility of the ecumenical church. Three great approaches to Christianity—literalistic, liberal, sacramentarian—seemingly irreconcilable, are shown by the author to be in reality contributing factors to something deeper underlying them all. But the presentation is not so simple as that. All the mental resources of the reader of this book will be challenged to keep step with profound and subtle reasoning. The work is evidently intended for the study of clergymen and the classroom of theological students, where the contents can be, as it were, pre-digested and then administered to the members of the Christian church in small amounts. To this end we commend and recommend.

J. L. FOREMAN

The Place of Nationalism in Religion, by J. W. C. Ward, Evanston, Ill., Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 1940, pp. 26, $0.25.

A sermon. The preacher maintains that nationalism has a real and important part to play in religion, and, consequently, we must expect religion to express itself along national lines. He asks what effect nationalism in religion is likely to have upon the world's present struggle towards international unity. He is an Anglican, and he sees in the network of national churches of the Anglican Communion the form of organization for the promotion of Christian reunion which should assist in the development of international friendship and coöperation.

There is something provincial about the sermon. The preacher seems to recognize only the ecclesiastical organizations and the movements in his own Communion. Has he not heard of the great interdenominational and international Christian movements as represented in the world conferences at Oxford, Edinburg, and Amsterdam, and the World Council of Churches in process of formation? J. H. FRANKLIN

The Church and a Christian Society, by Wade Crawford Barclay, New York, Abingdon, 1939, pp. 428, $3.50.

The author is a Methodist minister and one of the leaders of religious education within his denomination. He writes voluminously—too voluminously—concerning the religious education of adults; that is to say, his book is an adult education document. A real service is rendered thereby since most studies in the field of religious education have had to do with pre-adult people.

Two items attracted the reviewer's attention, namely, that of worship and that of the proper use of the Bible in religious education. With the former the author deals illuminatingly, but regarding the latter he fails to consider any one of the real issues; for instance, how can we hope to make a prescientific literature effective in our time? It can be done, it must be done, but Dr. Barclay does not help us any.

W. R. MCNUTT

'Way Away Tales, translated and edited by Edward Norman Harris, Philadelphia, Judson Press, 1940, pp. 142, $2.00.

To write this notice is a pleasure not a chore. I thoroughly enjoyed reading the book, and intend to reread it frequently. The natural and whimsical way in which Dr. Harris retells these old folk tales of the Karens, among whom he worked

for thirty-eight years, quite won me. It would be a pity to spoil the reader's pleasure by trying to describe the tales—let him have the fun at first hand. Suffice it to say that if the "Adventures of Saw Kay, or Mr. Crooked" were the only stories in the book, they would be worth the money. Numerous pen and ink illustrations, which really illustrate, by Charles N. Steinbacker from sketches by Dr. Harris add to the reader's delight—at least they did to mine. Nor will the student of folklore wish to disregard this addition to his field. This is but one of many volumes from the pen of one of Crozer's gifted and devoted sons.

MORTON S. ENSLIN

The King James Version of the English Bible, by David Daiches, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1941, pp. vii, 228, $1.75.

This compact volume is the result of a critical study of the relation of the book of Isaiah to the various earlier translations and to the extant Hebrew text. By way of introduction two important facts are stressed. The first is that from the time of Jerome until the beginning of the sixteenth century there was a lamentable ignorance in Christianity of the original language. The Vulgate had preëmpted the claims of inspiration. An important sketch is then presented of the various significant translations, with a critical evaluation of each.

The members of the translation committee, their individual qualifications, and the rules by which they were to be guided—fourteen points in all—are carefully presented. Then follows a critical comparison of the A.V. with the Hebrew and the most significant early translations, phrase by phrase and word by word, wherever definite influence is detected. This work, which is carefully done, leads to the conclusion that the A.V. is, on the whole, as accurate a rendering as the combined Christian scholarship of Europe would at that time have been able to produce—and at the same time preserves a surprising number of traditional Jewish renderings.

I. G. MATTHEWS

Chart for Happiness, by Hornell Hart, New York, Macmillan, 1940, pp. vii, 198, $2.00.

This book on happiness has made me very unhappy. It seems almost horrible that one should work out a questionnaire for persons to test their altruism to see if they have enough of it to be happy. It is even worse to suggest that religion is something one can make use of in order to attain happiness; if your score is unsatisfactory, "religion has great potential services to render you" (see p. 79). Put God in the place of religion and read that sentence again. "God becomes a glorified bottle of medicine. As though he could be experienced on those terms." How far removed is that from paganism and magic—the manipulation of the gods for man's own ends? And worst of all is the *euphorimeter* scale, a sort of eudæmonistic thermometer for testing whether one's happiness is above zero or below. It reminds one of Vachel Lindsay's poem:

> There's machinery in the butterfly
> And a mainspring to the bee.

GORDON POTEAT

The Creed of Christ, by Gerald Heard, New York, Harper, 1940, pp. 169, $2.00.

Gerald Heard is an Englishman whose training is in anthropology and psychology, but whose deepest interest is in the practice of religious faith. This book is his interpretation of the Lord's Prayer. Its flavor can be tested in the following extracts:

> Whatever the Christ of the Gospels may be, he is not presented to us as a scholar or even as "a man of the mean," a gentleman whose motto is Tallyrand's instruction for the diplomat, "pas de zèle." We are told that those who saw him had quite the contrary impression, for they remembered it was written, "The zeal of thy house has eaten me up." There is undoubtedly more than a suggestion of white heat of being, of an intensity of consciousness, far closer to the incandescent focus of creative genius, the integral thought and action of the supreme artist, the inspired creator, than to the cool, critical, analytical intelligence of the collector.
>
> The critics have too often stepped in and ruled what such a being (Jesus) could do by the laws of probability which they have formed in their minds, while they have lived lives which were both restricted in experience and of quite modest, if respectable, moral and spiritual attainment.
>
> We are separated by creeds; we fall asunder when we assert and dispute over what we maintain that we have found and defined and what we hold others to have missed or misconstrued. We are united by prayer, we are brought together, when we own our ignorance, our helplessness, our uneradicated will to have our way, to dominate and to exclude. The deeper the prayer, the more the self is lost in apprehension of the unspeakable One, the deeper is the unity, for unity with man is a by-product of union with the One and will only be accomplished that way.

One wishes there were space for other quotations. Many books are stereotyped; this is fresh. Many books repeat in slightly altered ways what has often been better expressed before; this is suggestive of new points of view and is distinguished by the beauty of its writing, as well as by the practical import of its thought.

GORDON POTEAT

The Four Pillars of Democracy, by Edgar J. Goodspeed, New York, Harper, 1940, pp. 148, $1.50.

An expert in the field of New Testament scholarship has turned preacher. And why not? These essays as sermons are good. The hortatory tone is excellent and not too obtrusive. Although important words such as religion, humanism, and faith are used vaguely and ambiguously, yet the phrasing is clear and catholic. However, sermons are to be listened to and heeded and not criticized.

I. G. MATTHEWS

French Pioneers in the West Indies, 1624–1664, by Nellis M. Crouse, New York, Columbia University Press, 1940, pp. 294, $3.50.

This is a well-written book, the interest and enjoyment of which should by no means be confined to students of history. It is essentially a story of winning the islands from native possessors and of the pioneer work of colonization. The author shows how the governors, fully aware of the distance separating them from France, ran things much their own way until they were finally able to purchase the islands for themselves. The narrative is interspersed with an excellent account of the days when buccaneers used these harbors as ports of call where they might refit their ships and spend their ill-gotten gains.

A. R. MOORE

Glimpses of Mennonite History, by John C. Wenger, Scottsdale, Penna., Mennonite Publishing House, 1940, pp. xii, 126, $0.75.

While this volume is intended for use in Mennonite schools, including winter Bible schools, it tells a story which all should know. The author has selected his material with care, and, although his treatment is necessarily brief, he has given an excellent introductory study of the history of the Mennonite Church. The first part of the book concerns the origin of the church with brief biographies of the early leaders. After tracing the history of the various European Mennonite groups, the author turns to the Mennonites in America and follows the pioneering period of migration and settlement and the transition period of adjustment, through to the "Great Awakening" in the church, 1880–1910. The closing chapters treat with church customs, theology, hymnody, and the principles of nonresistance. One also finds the Dordrecht Confession of Faith (1632) reprinted in an English translation. The author has added to the usefulness of his book by a good index and a brief English bibliography of Mennonite history. Moreover, for those who will use the book in the classroom he has added an objective test on the facts in the book.

A. R. MOORE

Agrarian Conflicts in Colonial New York, 1711–1775, by Irving Mark, New York, Columbia University Press, 1940, pp. 237, $3.00.

This study concerns the differences of landlord and small farmer in those portions of the Hudson Valley which were the centres of agrarian discontent before the Revolution. It points out that land speculators and boundary disputes aided tenant-farmer agitation against landlord dominance and resulted in agrarian disturbances culminating in "The Great Rebellion of 1766." The author's findings will assist others to carry forward their study of the social and economic cleavage which prevailed in colonial America.

A. R. MOORE

The Christian Attitude Toward War, by Loraine Boettner, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1940, pp. 119, $1.00.

This book is an able exposition of the convictions concerning war held by a writer who believes in the plenary inspiration of the Bible. He insists that "the Scriptures reveal God as a God of war as well as a God of peace." In the Old Testament war to gain righteous ends is not only permitted but commended, and this teaching is considered so explicit as to account for the silence of the New Testament on the matter. The author declares that love of enemies may be practiced while resisting them in self-defense, and that the love of God must not be emphasized at the expense of his justice. He admits, however, that Jesus does "clearly forbid warfare as a means of propagating the gospel."

The writer presents sin as the basic cause of war and urges that there can be no permanent peace apart from human regeneration. The fallacy of the pacifist movement is declared to be that it believes reform can be accomplished without redemption. The leaders of this movement are represented as having come in "unduly large proportion . . . . from the ranks of the socialists, humanists, modernists, atheists and communists."

Upon the basis of these and other considerations the author concludes that conscription is necessary and beneficent, and that war is useful in bringing judgment

upon sinful nations. He labors the point that the consequences of war are not all bad, and at the same time, avows that war is a great evil, the scourge of which will be lifted only when "the Christian gospel . . . . is made effective in the lives of individuals and through them in the nations." RITTENHOUSE NEISSER

How Firm a Foundation, by James C. Muir, Philadelphia, National Publishing, 1941, pp. 292, $2.50.

This volume offers itself as "A survey of the New Testament and the birth and establishment of Christianity in the light of archæology and secular history." It is written in an interesting style and abounds with references to contemporary customs and literature. The reader does not go far without noticing the author's disposition to compel the facts to support his preconceived convictions.

An illustration of the way in which the biblical material is handled is given in the chapter on "The Coming of Christ," where the writer says, "Genealogies in Matthew and Luke link him to the royal house of David. Since Jesus was of virgin birth, the family tree of Joseph can have little more than minor meaning. Davidic descent must have been through his mother." These problems cannot thus be dismissed lightly by the intelligent and honest student.

In a work with so many references to archæological and historical sources, the reader needs the assurance that all possible care has been taken to guarantee their reliability. In his account of Jesus' sermon in the synagogue at Nazareth (p. 113), the author represents *Isaiah* as having fed the widow, and *Elijah* as having healed Naaman. These evident inaccuracies in a familiar story naturally raise the question as to the dependability of other material which the ordinary reader cannot easily verify. RITTENHOUSE NEISSER

The Book of English Collects, from the Prayer Books of the Anglican Communion: England, Scotland, Ireland, Canada, South Africa, and the United States of America; with Notes, and an Essay on the Collect Form, by John Wallace Suter, Jr., New York, Harper, 1940, pp. lii, 432, $2.90.

The subtitle characterizes the contents of the book. The Collect, as a form of prayer, used in the Prayer Book of those churches within the Anglican Communion is difficult to define, the more because many attempts to do so have only made clear the diversity of opinions. The author has written, "The word Collect is best used to identify a particular literary prayer-form: a certain mould into which prayer-words are poured: one which, while admitting variations within limits, yet adheres to recognizable rules of composition" (p. xxviii). "A Collect is a written prayer intended primarily to be said aloud on behalf of a worshipping congregation" (p. xxix).

For the liturgical church this book will prove an invaluable source of material for study, comparison (because of the "Notes on the Collects"), and understanding. For the free church and its ministers the book will be no less important. The prayer literature of the Anglican Church is a never-failing stimulation and inspiration to those whose sense of prayer includes the impressive power of gracious utterance. Evangelical ministers could well use these Collects at determined places throughout their services; *e.g.,* before or after the pastoral prayer, as a part of the offertory prayer, before and after the sermon.

ROBERT E. KEIGHTON

BOOKS RECEIVED

Introduction to Youth, by Erdman Harris, New York, Macmillan, 1940, pp. xii, 221, $1.75.

This is an excellent handbook for parents and teachers who are responsible for adolescent youth. It is modern, practical, clear in its advice, the product of the experience of a master in a boys' school.

Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, edited by Florence R. Day, New York, Columbia University Press, 1940, pp. vi, 736, $3.00.

This large volume contains fifty-nine papers on various phases of contemporary social work which were given at the National Conference of Social Work held in Grand Rapids in 1940. Subjects dealt with include youth, migrants, refugees, relief, health and medical care, rural communities, housing, industry and labor, children, unmarried parents, etc. There is an excellent index.

Cross Examined, by Edward Kuhlmann, Columbus, Lutheran Book Concern, 1940, pp. 95, $0.85.

A series of sermons for the lenten season.

The Promises of God, by Henry Young, Columbus, Lutheran Book Concern, 1940, pp. 98, $0.85.

Eight sermons.

A Handbook of the Bible, by Gerald E. Se Boyar, New York, F. S. Crofts, 1940, pp. viii, 247, $1.25.

This convenient little book is intended to supply concise information about the characters and places mentioned in the Bible. Literary and artistic works inspired by the Bible are frequently listed. A handy book for an ignorant world.

Discussion of Holidays in the Later Middle Ages, by Edith Cooperrider Rodgers, New York, Columbia University Press, 1940, pp. 147, $1.50.

A valuable study of holidays between 1200 and 1520, with adequate discussion of such related subjects as protests against their non-observance and objections to their observance.

Our Great Salvation, by W. E. and E. W. Schramm, Columbus, Lutheran Book Concern, n.d., 2nd ed., pp. 109, $1.00.

Two series each of seven sermons; the first series based on John 3:16, the second on "The Centrality of the Cross."

Ignatius, His Conclave, by John Donne; reproduced in facsimile with an introduction by C. M. Coffin, New York, Columbia University Press, 1941, pp. xxiv, viii, 149, $1.60.

Another of the excellent facsimiles, this time of the essay of John Donne (1611) on the Jesuits. The author's views are evidenced by the subtitle, *His Inthronisation in a Late Election in Hell.*

Eight American Praxapostoloi, by Kenneth W. Clark, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1941, pp. 204 and 8 plates, $2.00.

A very valuable volume for the textual critic. It contains a brief introduction and collation of each of the eight *praxapostoloi* (manuscripts of Acts and Epistles) in American collections: 223, 876, 1022, 1799, 1960, 2401, 2412, 2423, together with a photostat of a sample page of each. It is patient work such as this which, although unnoticed by the majority, pushes horizons back.

**How to Find Health through Prayer,* by Glenn Clark, New York, Harper, 1940, pp. 154, $1.50.

**Science, Philosophy and Religion: A Symposium,* published by the Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion, New York, 1941, pp. 443, $1.50.

**Form and Freedom in Worship,* by Clarence Seidenspinner, Chicago, Willett, Clark, 1941, pp. xii, 186, $2.00.

**Benedictine Monasticism,* by (Sister) M. Alfred Schroll, New York, Columbia University Press, 1941, pp. 217, $2.75.

**The Philosophy of Schleiermacher,* by Richard W. Brandt, New York, Harper, 1941, pp. viii, 350, $3.00.

**The Meaning of Revelation,* by H. Richard Niebuhr, New York, Macmillan, 1941, pp. x, 196, $2.00.

**Religion and the Modern World,* by fifteen guests at the Bicentennial Conference of the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1941, pp. 192, $2.00.

**Wisdom and Folly in Religion,* by Joseph Haroutunian, New York, Scribner, 1940, pp. xiv, 174, $2.00.

**The Great Century: A.D. 1800–A.D. 1914,* by Kenneth Scott Latourette, New York, Harper, 1941, pp. ix, 516, $3.50.

**Biography of the Gods,* by A. Eustace Haydon, New York, Macmillan, 1941, pp. xiii, 352, $2.50.

The Sacred Tree Script, by Andrew Efron, New Haven, Tuttle, Morehouse and Taylor, 1941, pp. xii, 372, no price.

"The esoteric foundation of Plato's wisdom." This volume should make any head reel.

**The Man Christ Jesus,* by John Knox, Chicago, Willett, Clark, 1941, pp. 100, $1.00.

**The Code of Christ,* by Gerald Heard, New York, Harper, 1941, pp. xxi, 168, $1.50.

* To be reviewed.